The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: **Police Encounters with Juvenile Suspects: Explaining the Use of Authority and Provision of Support, Final Report**

Author(s): **Stephanie M. Myers**

Document No.: **205125**

Date Received: **April 2004**

Award Number: **2000-IJ-CX-0039**

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

POLICE ENCOUNTERS WITH JUVENILE SUSPECTS:

EXPLAINING THE

USE OF AUTHORITY AND PROVISION OF SUPPORT

Final Report to the National Institute of Justice
Project # 2000-IJ-CX-0039

STEPHANIE M. MYERS

Submitted to the faculty of the
School of Criminal Justice, University at Albany,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Oral Defense - - July 24, 2002

School of Criminal Justice
2002

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

POLICE ENCOUNTERS WITH JUVENILE SUSPECTS:

Explaining the Use of Authority and Provision of Support

Stephanie M. Myers

COPYRIGHT 2002

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

ABSTRACT

There has recently been growing concern about the incidence and seriousness of juvenile offending. This concern has stimulated renewed interest in the juvenile justice system, with particular attention to how juveniles are processed in and out of the system. As gatekeepers to the criminal justice system, patrol officers play an integral part in determining which juveniles make their way into the system. Little is known about those juveniles who have contact with the police and are subsequently released with a reprimand that is something other than a formal police response. Research on police which employs a method of systematic social observation reveals other actions officers take, including but not limited to arrest, in their attempts to resolve problems with juveniles. It also reveals a clearer picture of the types of offenses and problems in which juveniles are involved and under what circumstances a juvenile enters the juvenile justice system.

This dissertation work studies police juvenile interactions using data collected for the Project on Policing Neighborhoods, a multi-method study of police for which the core methodology was systematic social observation of police. This data source offers a unique opportunity to examine both official and unofficial police-juvenile contacts.

This research has produced empirical evidence about the types of problems juveniles are involved in (and interact with the police about) and the extent to which variation in police outcomes is attributable to officer and situational characteristics. Findings presented here confirm some of what previous researchers reported twenty and thirty years ago; that police use of authority is patterned to some extent by the seriousness of the offense, the evidence available, and the demeanor of the suspect. Findings also suggest that police are both authoritative agents of social control and service providers with juvenile suspects, though they use their authority more often than they provide support. This research also reveals that while authority seems to be patterned mostly by situational factors, supportive behaviors are patterned more by the characteristics of the individual officers.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table of Contents

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

CHAPTER ONE

POLICING JUVENILES: AN INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is a study of police-juvenile interactions. It focuses on police use of authority toward, and police provision of support and assistance to juveniles encountered by patrol officers while working the street. This study will examine the relationships between these types of behavior (authority and support) and the attitudes and characteristics of individual officers as well as situational factors that confront officers when they encounter juvenile suspects. In this first chapter, I will highlight the key elements of my research.

In recent years there has been growing concern about the incidence and seriousness of juvenile offending. Local and national media regularly alert American families to instances of juvenile crime. This growing awareness and concern has prompted renewed attention to the juvenile justice system and how juveniles are processed in and out of the system. Political officials are responsive to public "fear and anger at what is perceived to be an epidemic of youth violence" by vowing to get tough on juvenile crime (Scott and Grisso, 1997: p. 137). Some argue that the concept of juvenile justice has been changing as a result of what many perceive as an out of control youth population. While the foundation of the juvenile justice system rests on the ideals of justice *and rehabilitation*, the responses of policy-makers to the recent media attention to juvenile crime has helped transform the juvenile justice system into a penal institution (Feld, 1997 p. 68) - resembling the adult system of criminal justice, the system from which we initially sought to protect juveniles. While in depth reviews of the juvenile justice 'process' are under way, the police part of the

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

process is often overlooked. Considering the police role in the juvenile justice system, this deficiency in research needs to be addressed.

Juvenile arrests have increased 35% within the past 10 years and now account for 20% of all arrests (Sourcebook; 1997). However, these official statistics represent only a fraction of the contacts between police and juvenile troublemakers, and they capture only one course of action that officers might take when trying to reach some resolution and/or curb future problems. Little is known about those juveniles who have contact with the police and are subsequently released with a reprimand that is something other than a formal police response. Research on police which employs a method of systematic social observation reveals other actions officers take, including but not limited to arrest, in their attempts to resolve problems with juveniles. It also reveals a clearer picture of the types of offenses and problems in which juveniles are involved and under what circumstances a juvenile enters the juvenile justice system.

As gatekeepers to the juvenile justice system, the police begin the criminal justice process by making the initial decisions about how to handle incidents involving juveniles. In deciding how to dispose of these incidents, the police have a wide repertoire of responses available to them. This latitude is a necessary element to police work as patrol officers are presented with various and often complex situations (Whitaker, 1982). Practically, then, it is the nature of police work itself that in most cases allows individual patrol officers to decide how they will handle both the incidents brought to their attention, as well as those discovered independently as they work the street. In light of this discretion, one should be concerned with how police make decisions involving juveniles as it is an important decision,

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

one which may formally classify juveniles (correctly or incorrectly) as delinquents and introduce them to the juvenile justice system. Research on police decision making with juveniles is necessary so that we may increase our knowledge of the kinds of problems in which juveniles are involved, so that we might better understand how police make their judgements about juvenile suspects, and so that we may later study the effects of police decisions - that is, the impact police might have on future juvenile offending and trouble-making. The first two of these research needs are the focus of this dissertation.

Defining Two Dimensions of Police Behavior

Extant research has identified great variation in the ways officers respond to suspected violators (see, Bayley, 1986; Black, 1980; Klinger, 1996; McIver and Parks, 1983; Worden,1989) and at least two conceptual dimensions of police behavior are apparent: police use of authority and police provision of support and assistance. The police role is by nature "explicitly" concerned with authority, with controlling the behavior of others, and it is only "latently" concerned with support (Cumming, Cumming, and Edell, 1965: p. 277).[1] Police might be said to 'specialize' in the use of coercive authority but that does not mean that there is not another dimension to their work. In fact, officers who are better able to balance a 'dual role', including control *and* support, might be the most exemplary of their kind. My research will examine these two dimensions of police behavior (authority and support) and how they are utilized with juvenile suspects and disputants.

[1]Police may keep this side of their role 'latent' in an attempt to avoid role conflict (Cumming et.al., 1965: p. 277).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Theorizing about Police Decision-Making with Juveniles

It is widely known and accepted that police officers have high degrees of discretion and autonomy from supervisory and organizational authority (Lipsky, 1980; Brown, 1988). Patrol officers tend to work in isolation, not necessarily by choice but by the nature of the work itself, where there is no immediate supervision. While police agencies provide a demanding set of rules and guidelines to follow, it is the officer herself who must make on the spot decisions to resolve situations. Laws, statutes, and ordinances are often vague or inapplicable and, subsequently, do not provide much guidance for decision-making on the street. Other department initiatives, such as community policing or problem-oriented policing initiatives, might be equally ambiguous and as a result provide no simple solutions to real problems. In addition, the handling of juvenile problems could add more uncertainty to police-work. Police have to manage the application of laws specific to juveniles where juveniles are at times treated as adults and other times not (McNamara, 1967).[2]

In turn, individual police officers determine the nature, amount, and quality of both benefits (support and assistance) and sanctions (authority) distributed by their agency (Lipsky, 1980). Individual officers decide who will and will not be arrested, who will receive a citation, and who will and will not be informed about another agency that may offer assistance with a particular problem. How do officers make these decisions? On what do they base their decisions?

We know that police behavior varies. We know, for example, that all officers would

[2]This might even be cause for police to, at times, shy away from handling juvenile problems.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

not utilize the same level of authority in a given situation. Rather officers vary in their responses to people and situations (see Brown, 1988; Muir, 1977; White, 1972; Broderick, 1987). Researchers who discuss different 'types' of police officers or 'styles' of policing report that officers do not all behave in the same manner. Rather some officers are, for example, more aggressive than others, or more comfortable with using their authority, and as a result might utilize more authority and might approach situations differently than other officers (Brown, 1988; Muir, 1977). Some are selective while others are not selective at all and hand out citations and make arrests whenever the opportunity arises (Brown, 1988). Officers may be cynical about their work and the citizens they interact with, labeling them as mostly bad, suspicious, people (Broderick, 1987; Neiderhoffer, 1969); others see people as mostly good-natured and are genuinely concerned with being fair and with using their knowledge and skills to aid the citizens they encounter (Muir, 1977; Broderick, 1987; Brown, 1981). Variation in behavior does exist, all patrol officers do not go about their jobs the same way and we would not expect that all officers would utilize the same type or level of authority in a given situation, nor would we expect them to provide the same type or level of support. But what factors influence the level of authority they utilize and the degree of support they provide?

Theorizing about what affects police behavior has generally taken three approaches, either independently or in combination: psychological; sociological; and organizational. Psychological theories of police behavior rest on the proposition that officers' actions are influenced by their own outlooks and background characteristics (e.g., education level achieved, training, length of service, attitudes about policing and about the people they serve,

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

etc.) (Neiderhoffer, 1969; Muir, 1977; Brown; 1988; Worden, 1989; Worden, 1992). Sociological theories rest on the proposition that officer behavior is influenced at least in part by the situation they confront and the distribution of different aspects of social life (e.g., the race and SES of the suspect and complainant, demeanor of the suspect or complainant, how many other officers are present, etc.) (Black, 1976; Black and Reiss, 1967; Black and Reiss, 1970; Friedrich, 1982; Smith and Vischer, 1981; White, 1972; Worden, 1989; Worden, 1992). And, proponents of organizational theories believe that, to a significant extent, the police organization (the chief, supervisors, organizational rules and procedures, etc.) influences officer behavior (Wilson, 1968; Smith, 1984; Fyfe, 1988; Friedrich, 1982; Manning, 1978; Mastrofski, et.al., 1987; Guyot, 1991; Worden, 1989). In addition to the above three approaches, there has also been a recent surge of interest in the impact of community factors on police behavior as some expect that variations in service conditions (e.g., crime levels) might affect how a patrol officer uses his discretion when making decisions about suspects (Klinger, 1997).

These theoretical orientations have been used in the past to explain choices that police officers make while handling problems with suspects. To date there has been little research examining police decision-making with juveniles. Extant research in this area examines the influence of situational factors on police discretion. That is, the extent to which police behavior is patterned, for example, by victim preferences, seriousness of the offense, evidentiary strength, and demeanor.

One might suppose that police decision making with juvenile suspects turns on different factors than decisions regarding adults. Police might feel they have even more

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

latitude with juveniles and they may, for example, rely less on situational factors of a legal nature to inform their decisions. Further, inasmuch as police make decisions based on their own sense of what ought to be done, they might be even more inclined to do so when the citizen with whom they interact is a juvenile. With this in mind, these theoretical orientations should be applied to police-juvenile interactions in an attempt to identify which factors affect officers' judgments with juveniles and to see if patterns of decision-making with juveniles are at all similar to those with adults.

This research will examine both the psychological and sociological theories of police behavior and how they help to explain decision-making with juvenile suspects and disputants (I will refer to suspects and disputants as "suspects" in the text). It is hypothesized that in making decisions, officers rely on their own experiences as patrol officers, their backgrounds and attitudes, as well as any cues that might be available to them in the immediate situation. I will examine the direct effects of both situational and individual factors on police behavior as well as the interaction of some individual and situational factors as it seems plausible that in reality decision-making occurs as the individual interacts with and responds to the situation with which they are presented. These two theoretical frameworks will be reviewed, in detail, in chapter three.

Previous Research and Findings on Policing Juveniles

There is currently a paucity of research on how the police behave and the choices they make while interacting with juveniles. Some research has examined specialized juvenile officers, either as they patrolled streets or as they made decisions after a juvenile had been

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

referred to their unit (Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Hohenstein, 1969; McEachern and Bauzer, 1967; Terry, 1967; Wordes, Bynum and Corley, 1994). These examinations mostly looked at officers' 'use of authority' as police made decisions about arrest, detention, and referrals to other social service and social control agencies.

Other research has examined patrol officers' encounters with juvenile suspects, employing a method of social observation which enables researchers to examine outcomes that would not normally be accounted for in official records (Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman et. al., 1978; Worden and Myers, 1999). Black and Reiss (1970) and Lundman et.al. (1978) focus on the arrest decision; the study by Worden and Myers (1999), from which my dissertation research stems, examines police arrest practices with juveniles as well as officers' use of other forms of authority (commands, threats, investigative tactics, and advising). One other study utilizes police-juvenile contact records from 1968 to 1975 to analyze police arrest practices with juveniles (Sealock and Simpson, 1998). No previous studies focus on police provision of support or assistance with juvenile suspects. And all of the above studies typically took a situational approach to explaining police decision-making with juveniles in that they looked to factors available in the officers' immediate situation to see if they had a bearing on police outcomes. More specifically, the focus was on the influence of both legal and extralegal factors.

The influence of the seriousness of the offense and the amount of evidence available to the officer is well documented in extant research. Research on police - juvenile interactions suggest that these events are more likely than not of a minor legal nature and that when the offense *is* a serious one (e.g., a felony) and the evidence is strong, police are more

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

likely to make an arrest (Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman et.al., 1978; Sealock and Simpson, 1998; Worden and Myers, 1999). Likewise, when juvenile specialists make decisions other than arrest (detention decisions, referral decisions, etc.) and when patrol officers make decisions (e.g., detention decisions) regarding juveniles that occur later in the process than the decision to arrest, they too tend to be influenced by offense seriousness (Hohenstein, 1969; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Terry, 1967; Wordes et.al., 1994).

Police also tend to consider and respond to complainants' preferences when making decisions - in fact, one study finds that when police *initiate* an encounter with a juvenile they are significantly less likely to arrest than when they are responding to a complainant's request for police assistance (see Worden and Myers, 1999). As you might expect, when complainants request that a juvenile be arrested, the police are more likely to make an arrest (Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman et.al., 1978). One interesting finding is that there is strong evidence that when the complainant is a minority the police utilize more authority in the form of not only arrest, but also in the form of investigation (searches, questioning) and commands or threats (Worden and Myers, 1999). Also, when complainants request that the police do not make an arrest, police are less likely to take this action. This might be partly explained by the fact that when an offense is of a minor legal nature, the police may need complainants to sign a formal complaint in order to make an arrest. Although, police do not always make an arrest even if the offense is a serious one; the decision might still be left to the complainant - or at least open to input from the complainant.

With the absence of organizational and supervisory control, a lack of concrete decision-making rules, and the realization that legal factors do not determine police actions,

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

social scientists have turned to extralegal factors such as the demeanor, race, sex, and socioeconomic status of suspects to help explain police decision-making with juveniles (and adults). Research has consistently found that juveniles who are disrespectful toward the police are more likely to be arrested (Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman et.al., 1978; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Worden and Myers, 1999). Furthermore, observational studies done by Black and Reiss and Lundman et. al. in the sixties and seventies suggest that police arrest minority juveniles at a higher rate than white juveniles. And more recent research that analyze official records paint a similar picture, suggesting that minorities are more likely to be arrested as well as detained and referred to other agencies (Wordes and Bynum, 1995; Wordes et.al., 1994; Sealock and Simpson, 1998). At least one study's findings suggest that juveniles of lower SES are more likely to be arrested as well (Sealock and Simpson, 1998). However, each of these findings were born out of analyses where complainant preference and suspect demeanor could not be accounted for - two factors that have proven to be important predictors in other studies. More recent observational research, which controls for demeanor and victim preference, as well as other legal factors like offense seriousness and evidence strength, suggests that race does not play a role in determining arrest, or other authoritative actions by the police (Worden and Myers, 1999). It also suggests that police are *not* more likely to arrest juveniles who appear to be of lower SES than those from the middle class. It does, however, provide evidence of a different police bias: a gender bias. Females are significantly *less likely* to be arrested by police than their male counterparts - even when controlling for offense seriousness, evidence strength, and victim preference.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Theoretical and Practical Contributions of this Research

In light of these findings one can say that previous research on policing juveniles has produced some evidence about the influence of situational factors on police decisions to arrest, command and threaten, investigate, and advise juveniles - however the evidence is not conclusive and we should work to further explain police decisions in these encounters. While legal and extralegal factors clearly have some bearing on officers' decisions, they are not, by any means, determinative. This dissertation research will provide additional insight into policing juvenile suspects by using two theoretical approaches: a psychological (or individual) and sociological (or situational) approach. As Donald Black (1976) notes, these two theoretical frameworks are not at odds with one another, rather they are "two different kinds of explanation, different ways of predicting the facts" (8). These two frameworks can be synthesized into one as a social-psychological approach (see Worden, 1989 for an example). This dissertation will explore the influence of situational factors as well as officer characteristics and attitudes on police behavior with juveniles. It is my contention that in reality integrating these two kinds of explanations makes sense, as decision-making occurs as the individual meets up with the situation to which he/she is presented.

This research has both practical and theoretical significance. It will inform policy makers on the types of problems that juveniles are involved in on a day-to-day basis and it will provide insight into how police come to interact with juveniles and how they resolve juvenile problems. Theoretically, this research focuses on two key dimensions of police behavior (use of authority and provision of support) and works to develop explanations (i.e., models) of police decision-making which are necessary to better understand police-juvenile

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

interactions. Practically, and theoretically as well, inasmuch as the variation in behavior might correspond to variation in outcomes, these dimensions of behavior might better capture the variety of actions taken by the police and that decisions made by patrol officers do not turn alone on the decision to arrest. Further, this research might aid police administrators by providing information on how the characteristics, backgrounds, and attitudes of individual officers, as well as cues available to an officer in the immediate situation, affect decision-making on the street. This might have implications for selection and training.

Research on police decision-making with juveniles is a timely addition to a growing body of literature on police discretion generally. Utilizing data collected for the Project on Policing Neighborhoods (POPN), a multi method study of police, this research will produce empirical evidence about the types of problems juveniles are involved in (and interact with the police about), the ways in which police patrol officers handle their interactions with juvenile troublemakers, and how police outcomes with juveniles are shaped by officer and situational characteristics.

In the next chapter I will first discuss police behavior conceptually, identifying how it has been conceived in the literature and linking these concepts to the two dimensions of behavior with which I am concerned. Second, I will review how police behavior has been captured and measured in previous research. In the third chapter a detailed discussion of the theoretical framework will be presented. Specifically I will review the psychological and sociological approaches to explaining police behavior with juveniles as well as the synthesis of these two approaches: a social-psychological approach. This chapter includes explicit

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

hypotheses for my research. In the fourth chapter, I will discuss the data and my analytical plan. Chapters Five through Seven are the analysis chapters: Chapter Five presents the descriptive statistics for all of the explanatory and dependent variables; Chapter Six and Seven present an examination of police authority and support, respectively. Finally, the conclusions and directives for future research are discussed in Chapter Eight.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPTUALIZING POLICE BEHAVIOR: AUTHORITY AND SUPPORT

What is it that the police do within the context of a police-citizen encounter and what decisions do they make? How do they make these decisions? Police rush to crisis scenes, make judgments, and impose resolutions (Bittner, 1974: p. 34); they settle disputes (Black, 1980); and they handle situations and people (Wilson, 1968: p. 31). Most practitioners and academics would categorize what the police do as law enforcement, order maintenance, or providing service to the public (Green and Klockars; 1991). These are very broad categories of what the police do. Describing police work in this way, while suitable for general conceptions of police work, makes it difficult to precisely conceptualize (and operationalize) the actions that police take, and the decisions they make. These categories of police behavior are too abstract and, police scholars incorrectly utilize these concepts to describe situations *and* responses (Bayley, 1986: 330).

Historically, the police role in society has been legitimized by the law, yet research consistently suggests that the police spend little time actually engaging in law enforcement (Wilson, 1968; Bittner, 1974; Walker, 1992). It has instead been observed that the majority of a patrol officer's day is consumed with maintaining order (Wilson, 1968; Bittner, 1974; Brown, 1988). Providing services to the public is another element of what the police do and over time these 'services' have become an essential, and expected, part of police work.

Extant research on police patrol officers repeatedly suggests that officers utilize a variety of actions to handle the citizens and situations with which they are presented (Black,

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1980; McIver and Parks, 1983; Bayley, 1986; Worden, 1989; Klinger, 1996). An inquiry into police actions with juveniles might reveal the same variation; juvenile arrest rates appear to be similar to adult arrest rates, around 15% (Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman et.al., 1978; Black, 1980; Smith and Visher, 1981; Bayley, 1986; Worden, 1989; Klinger, 1996). This leaves, on average, an estimated 85% of encounters where no arrest occurs and one could be left with the wrong impression: that the police 'do nothing' in the majority of cases they handle. On the contrary, some research has identified great variation in the ways officers respond to suspected violators and at least two conceptual dimensions of police behavior are evident: *police use of authority* and *police provision of support and assistance*. My research will examine both of these forms of police behavior.

Use of Authority

When patrol officers interact with juveniles who are suspected of some wrongdoing, it is likely that the responding officer will use his or her authority in some fashion - whether it be to question a juvenile, to warn, command, arrest, etc. These are all instances of police use of authority to handle a situation. While these actions have been previously observed in studies of police (Black, 1980; Bayley, 1986; Worden, 1989), we rarely see these behaviors as a focus of empirical research on explaining police decision-making.

The mere presence of a police officer represents a form of authority (Bittner, 1974; Black, 1980; Worden, 1989). As agents of social control, police have special powers and privileges which enable them to deprive persons of their liberty. General knowledge of police powers makes it commonsensical that when an officer arrives at the scene of some alleged

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

wrongdoing, he or she represents, conceptually and practically, an authoritative force. This authority comes not only from the laws and rights the police are there to protect, but also from the badge on their uniform, the weapons they carry, and when applicable (when some citizen asks for police assistance) their authority comes, at least in part, from the person(s) who called them to the scene in the first place. A police officer is seen as a compelling force; someone who has the authority to coerce another person's behavior. Essentially, this is the reason why we call the police to the scene of an offense or a dispute; because he or she *can do something about something* (Bittner, 1974).

It logically follows that in no situation do the police utilize no authority at all. Rather, police presence represents the lowest level of authority possible. A police officer's authority empowers him or her to choose among many courses of action and previous research has indicated that the police do in fact utilize a wide range of actions to handle situations. Given this knowledge, we still most often see police research focused on the arrest decision (Smith and Visher, 1981; Berk and Loseke, 1980; Mastrofski et. al., 1995; Worden and Pollitz, 1984), where making an arrest is seen as more authority (or more law) than not arresting (Black, 1976; Klinger, 1996). While the arrest decision is important and should be studied carefully for many reasons[3], one should be concerned theoretically and operationally with other actions that the police take, recognizing that the use of authority varies even when police do not make an arrest. One should be concerned with better capturing these other types of police actions - perhaps as arranged on a continuum (Klinger, 1996) or multiple continua, as they truly vary in life. These steps taken together would further the development

[3]One of which is that 'arrest' deprives a citizen of their liberty.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

of a better understanding of what the police do and how the actions they take vary with other social phenomena.

Providing Support and Assistance

Virtually no research on police provision of support and assistance has evolved, yet these types of behaviors have been identified in the literature (see Cumming et.al., 1965; McIver and Parks, 1983; and Bayley, 1986). Police are often referred to as social workers or street psychologists who are available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, yet we rarely recognize what these terms mean to police work - and why we refer to officers in this way. When considering the actions that patrol officers take with suspects, one immediately thinks of those responses on a use of authority continuum - we expect officers to do anything from inaction to a warning, a threat, a command, an arrest, etc. While it is true that police officers specialize in the use of authority as a means to social control, they also have another side to their work. At least one explanation for referring to police officers as social workers and/or psychologists might be that police do at times perform behaviors consistent with these roles. We often overlook this latent part of their role and the respective actions that one might classify as 'support' or 'assistance'.

Police may utilize supportive behaviors as a way to handle situations. It might be common for police officers to refer citizens to other agencies that may better assist in handling their problem. They may provide physical or medical assistance or possibly just some valuable information that may aid citizens with their problems. This might be assistance that citizens request or that police provide on their own initiative.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

In addition to providing these types of assistance, police often provide direct help, comfort and support to people in trouble.[4] Previous research on the police has illustrated that it is common for patrol officers to encounter citizens who are in highly emotional states, or possibly physically injured. Given this, police may often offer comfort to citizens or sympathize with their circumstance. Police may simply express an understanding of their present hardships. Or, an officer might utilize such comforting techniques as a way to obtain information and/or reach some resolution to a particular problem (Sykes and Brent, 1980). This dimension of behavior differs from the authoritative dimension in that these supportive actions are not coercive in nature. Citizens are not coerced into compliance, rather they are offered help and assistance which may enable them to solve their problems.

When one considers the community era in which police now work, practically the offering of both assistance and support might be seen as ingredients of exemplary police performance. Community policing espouses, among other things, that police be more creative in their decision-making and that they develop and use more tools for handling situations. It also advocates community building which involves building stronger, working, relationships with community members. Police community interactions which involve police officers providing support and assistance may help foster these relationships.

Theoretically, and practically as well, one might expect that the situations which call for assistance (providing physical assistance, information, and referrals) might also necessitate the provision of support and comfort. Thus, the factors that affect a patrol

[4]One might expect that police officers might be even more likely to offer support and assistance to 'victims'.
Often controlling one person means helping another (Cumming et.al., 1965: 277).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

officer's decision to use assistance tactics might also affect his or her utilization of comforting skills. For analytical purposes then, we might conceive officers' provision of assistance and support as a single dimension of behavior.

Patterns of Police Behavior

Notwithstanding the importance of the arrest decision, the infrequency with which it occurs (around 15% of the time) should compel us to look at other types of police action. As evidence of officers utilizing their authority in other ways, both Worden (1989) and Black (1980) provide evidence that police more often respond to citizens in the way of threats - over 30 percent of the time. Giving a stern warning to suspects has also been cited as a common way of resolving matters (Bayley, 1986). And, even when the focus of the research is on disputes in which evidence of physical violence is visibly present, arrest is reported only 28% of the time while mediation and separation occur 34% and 37% of the time, respectively (Smith, 1987). Taken together, this evidence leads us to believe that the arrest action is not the only way that the police utilize their authority when handling situations and that arresting someone might be reserved for more extreme cases. Informal courses of action (threats, warnings, mediation) are more likely to be utilized during a police-citizen interaction.

If police practices with juveniles are at all similar to practices with adults, most police-juvenile interactions are handled informally (Wordes and Bynum; 1995). That is not to say, however, that formal courses of action are never taken. Formal police actions might include taking a juvenile into custody, taking a report, referring to a social service agency or

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

juvenile court, giving a citation, or making an arrest (Walker; 1992). Previous research on policing juveniles indicates that informal courses of action are more common (Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman et.al., 1978). However, this does not mean that the police do nothing with the majority of juvenile suspects they encounter, this would imply that informal actions taken by the police are insignificant. Rather, the police may utilize their authority in other ways: by questioning a juvenile about a particular offense; conducting a search for evidence; negotiating for a particular outcome; asking for information; requesting a juvenile leave the area or cease disorderly/illegal behavior; or threatening to charge or make an arrest if the problem persists. While these courses of action might be considered informal in nature, as there may be no written record of the chosen outcome, they still represent officers' 'use of authority'. Further, these actions represent officers' attempts to handle the problem.

There is some evidence that police use authoritative and supportive behaviors within the same encounter. Donald Black (1980) reported that police will occasionally try to simply reassure or calm one or both parties involved in a dispute. In discussing officers' use of a *penal style* of law (this style focuses on finding the guilty party, the wrong-doer) and a *conciliatory style* of law (which focuses on compromise and reaching a solution that both parties of a dispute are satisfied with), Black (1980) did find that police officers were most likely to use a combination of these two styles. That is, their interest was in satisfying both parties involved in a dispute, but they also related to the parties in terms of who was to blame.

Other assistance and supportive actions have been referred to in the literature. Bayley

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

(1986) acknowledges officers who give friendly advice, who promise future police assistance, or provide a referral to another agency. Also see Worden (1989), where the behavioral response labeled 'counsel' captures similar behavioral responses including: providing information; referral to another agency; and offering reassurance. And, McIver and Parks discuss these 'assistance' tactics as a behavioral category, although they do not reveal how often these responses occur in the field. Klinger makes reference to these assistance behaviors in his work on the 'formal *authority* scale' - but he adds assistance and counseling to the 'authority scale' as a 'discuss' category (into which 60% of the cases fell) - in my opinion these actions might be part of another behavioral dimension that could be separated from use of authority: provision of support/assistance.

While the provision of support may occur less frequently than police use of authority, one would expect that at times patrol officers would utilize these techniques in an effort to calm the situation and to provide the support and assistance that a citizen may need and benefit from at that time. Indeed, the police role may be 'explicitly' concerned with authority and only 'latently' with support (Cumming et.al., 1965), but inasmuch as police and communities begin to work together (e.g., community policing) we might expect police to more frequently tap into their supportive role. In addition, one might expect that when interacting with juveniles, the police may be more prone to utilize these assistance and comforting techniques as juveniles might be viewed as being more responsive to, and in need of, such actions.

Previous Research on Authority and Support

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

There have been some attempts to conceptualize and quantify police behavior and the behavior of social control agents generally. Early theoretical initiatives of this nature appear in Donald Black's (1976) *The Behavior of Law*, which treats 'law' as a quantitative variable which varies from setting to setting and which is measurable in many ways (105). Other research by Bayley (1986) and McIver and Parks (1983) help to illustrate the variety of actions taken by the police when interacting with citizens, and they demonstrate the need for further work in classifying and quantifying police behavior[5]. Donald Black's work on quantifying law is widely cited and often utilized as a springboard for research on the use of authority by various criminal justice actors. Black identifies variation in the 'quantity' of law through the various actions of legal agents as well as through the actions of citizens. He classifies these actions as being more or less law relative to other actions or inaction. That is to say, a police officer who takes a report is considered more law than not taking a report, and a citizen reporting a crime to the police is more law than not reporting - so law can be quantified in many ways, and by the actions of both citizens and social control agents (i.e., police).

Black (1976) also discusses four distinct 'styles' of social control (styles of law): penal, which deals with prohibited conduct against society; compensatory, a style used when a specific victim demands action; therapeutic, a style of law which does not accuse one of wrongdoing as much as it identifies suspects as potential 'victims' in need of help; and

[5]Bayley (1986) identifies a variety of actions that can occur at contact, as part of the process, and at the end of a police-citizen encounter. McIver and Park's (1983) distinguish between actions which are legal sanctions (arrest, ticketing, etc.), extra-legal sanctions (e.g., force without arrest), assistance (comfort, referrals, information, etc.); undirected actions (e.g., investigative tactics, taking reports).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

finally, conciliatory, a style of law where disputing parties settle on a solution with the help of a legal agent. In addition to these four styles of law, Black also allows for an 'other' category, a 'prevention' category, and for the possibility that any combination of the four core styles might exist; he adds that in most situations a 'dominant' style of law can be identified.

Similarly, Worden (1989) identifies four modes of behavior utilized by the police when handling situations, particularly disputes: helping to settle an argument (mediating); persuading one of the disputants to leave the scene (separating); lecturing, threatening, or arresting one or more disputants (coercion); providing information, making a referral, or reassuring (counseling) (682-683). Similar to Black's work, Worden also allows for any combination of these four possible outcomes[6] as he acknowledges that often a police officer will utilize more than one tactic in order to achieve a desired outcome – if the categories are treated as independent actions only, they are not mutually exclusive (682).

While the labels and descriptions of Worden's 'approaches' to dispute resolution (1989) and Black's (1976) 'styles' of law differ, they are conceptually very similar when used to describe *police actions*. One might identify Worden's 'mediate' and 'counsel' *categories* and Black's 'therapeutic' and 'conciliatory' *styles* as conceptual categories of police 'assistance and support'. Worden defines the mediation category as "helped to settle an argument" and the counsel category as "provided information, made a referral, or reassured" (682-3) - both of these approaches might be seen as having mostly supportive

---

[6]In all, sixteen possible categories of police behavior and behavioral combinations are identified, adding 'arrest' and 'no action' as separate categories.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

characteristics. Similarly, Black defines his therapeutic style as one of a helping nature (most likely because the deviant is mentally ill, making it difficult to place blame) and his conciliatory style captures behavior that is aimed at reaching a compromise or resolution that will satisfy all parties. The prevailing theme, stemming from the way these styles and approaches are defined by the authors, is a theme which recognizes officers' 'helpful' actions, whether she be helping to settle an argument, offering referral information, or helping the parties reach a compromise which does not place blame on one party or the other. These behaviors are more enabling to citizens than they are restrictive. In a way, they allow citizens to comply or to solve their own problems - they are not representative of coerced compliance or of an outcome which is coercive in nature. This is not to say that these behaviors fit neatly into the supportive dimension of behavior, but the ways in which these behaviors are discussed by Black (1980) and Worden (1989) make it conceptually possible to recognize these behaviors as being characteristically supportive.

The remaining approaches and styles recognized by Worden (separate and coercion) and Black (penal and compensatory), respectively, might be considered conceptual categories of police 'use of authority'. Both the 'separate' and 'coercion' approaches defined by Worden have authoritative dimensions; separating parties involves using one's authority to request, suggest or demand a particular outcome - and, using other coercive tactics (threat, citation, arrest) requires, by the nature of the tactics, that an officer utilize her authority. Black's (1980) 'penal' and 'compensatory' styles have authoritative characteristics as well. Officers using these styles of law methodically identify one party as a victim, the other as the

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

offender, and they are concerned with punishment and compensation. Again, the purpose is not to suggest that a perfect fit exists between the behavioral approaches and styles identified by Worden (1989) and Black (1980), respectively, and an authoritative dimension of police behavior - but similarities exist to the point where one could make a connection on a conceptual level. Behavioral dimensions of support and authority are recognizable in both works and their research has significantly advanced the field in their attempts to better conceptualize and quantify police behavior.

Other attempts to expand the examination of police behavior from the arrest/no arrest dichotomy can be found in the policing literature. Smith (1987) created a nominal measure of police behavior to be applied in police-citizen encounters in which there is evidence of physical violence and where both parties were at the scene (victim and suspect) when the officer arrived (772). Smith's categories of police response reflect styles of control: *mediation*; *arrest* of one or more persons; and *separation* - "where each action reflects a style of control" (769).[7] Unlike Black (1976) and Worden (1989), Smith does not allow for possible permutations of these actions, they appear to be identified independently as the most

[7]Here Smith relies heavily on Donald Black's (1976, 1984) work which discusses styles of law - see my discussion in the preceding paragraphs.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

serious action taken in the encounter.[8] Smith's arrest and separation categories might be seen as evidence of an authoritative dimension of police behavior and his 'mediation' category might be seen as representative of assistance and support. However, none of the behavioral categories are discussed in great detail, making it hard to draw similarities between Smith's categories and these dimensions of behavior.

At least two other advances in conceptualizing and operationalizing police behavior are relevant to this discussion. First, in 1983, Sykes and Brent illustrated a new way to think of police behavior - they conceptualized outcomes as 'the relative severity of the outcome for the suspect' and they operationalized police action on a scale ranging from least to most severe to the citizen (see page 216). While this isn't exactly a measure of police use of authority or support, some of the ranked behaviors are representative of authoritative actions (arrest, report taking, imposing solutions, etc.). What is to be taken from their work, is not necessarily their 'measure of outcomes', but their willingness to look beyond the arrest action and, perhaps more importantly, their willingness to operationalize a 'dimension' of behavior

[8]If, for example, an officer tried to mediate the situation by reaching some compromise between parties and after failing to do this arrested one or both parties, how would this behavior be categorized? First, Smith does not allow for the combination of mediation and arrest to occur though one might expect that this behavior is possible - as is mediation and separation. And second, because Smith does his analysis at the encounter level it isn't possible to account for officer actions toward individual citizens. For example, if within a two party encounter one party is arrested and the other is not arrested, but did receive some mediation, the encounter would be coded as 'arrest' - this analysis forces one to lose sight of what is happening to 'both citizens' in the encounter and not only the one who receives the most serious outcome. Smith does not address this issue, instead he classifies each encounter as being one where the police either mediated, separated, or arrested one or more of the parties. In the past, police scholars (Worden and Black) have struggled to conceptualize police behavior in a way that might be operationalized so that not too much is lost between reality and statistics - and based on previous research one would not expect such a neat placement of behavior into one of three boxes. Although one might disagree with Smith's measure of police behavior, it does help to advance the field conceptually by expanding from the arrest, no arrest dichotomy.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

along an ordinal scale - ranging from least to most severe. However, the way the outcomes are ranked, from least to most severe, raises some questions.[9] First, it is not entirely clear why some outcomes are ranked as more severe than others (again, these behavioral outcomes are ranked in an order that is least to most severe *to the citizen* encountered by the police). The reason for this confusion is that the criteria for classifying outcomes along the scale are ambiguous themselves. While taking a report is ranked at level three (on a scale ranging from 1 to 9), imposing an alternative to arrest, when an arrest is possible, is ranked at level six. What is the difference between these two outcomes? At least part of the answer to this might be discovered by knowing exactly what is included in the 'imposing an alternative to arrest' category. Would this include, for example, threatening to arrest a citizen if the problem persists, referring the citizen to another agency, or maybe persuading the citizen to leave the area? Some citizens might consider 'taking an official report' to be more serious than any of these 'arrest alternatives' simply because report taking creates an 'official' record - something many citizens would be upset about.

A second and related problem with the scale created by Sykes and Brent (1983) is that there is no further description or definition of what these categories are. There is also some confusion over whether or not these are all 'police' behaviors. For example, one category is 'problem resolved through the interaction itself', another is 'no resolution'-- a reader should be concerned with what these really mean and with whether or not they even

[9]The scale, in order of least to most severe is: 1. Event of no interest to the police; 2. No resolution; 3. Official police report; 4. Problem resolved through interaction itself; 5. Negotiated an alternative to arrest when arrest was possible; 6. Imposed alternatives to arrest when arrest was possible; 7. Punitive ticket; 8. Arrest for misdemeanor; 9. Arrest for felony.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

involve *police* behavior. Another category is 'negotiated alternatives to arrest when arrest was possible'. What are the 'alternatives to arrest'? This does not appear to be a homogeneous category. Without knowing more about what these categories represent, its difficult to agree that these behavioral outcomes are ranked in an order which ranges from least to most severe toward citizens. Also, the possibility for combinations of these actions to occur is not accounted for - this is something one might want to consider when measuring the "amount" of authority - however Sykes and Brent's intent to measure the outcome as 'what it means to the citizen' might allow them to avoid addressing this issue. Even so, a citizen who is both arrested AND ticketed receives a more 'severe' outcome than one who is only arrested.

David Klinger's (1996) work is a step up conceptually and operationally with his creation of the 'formal authority scale' (FAS). Identifying a single dimension of behavior (use of authority), Klinger creates a continuum of police behavior on which police actions are ranked in terms of their authoritative value - "the amount of authority officers bring to bear in resolving encounters with citizens" (Klinger, 1996: 398). Similar to Sykes and Brent (1983), Klinger also codes the highest level of authority taken at the close of the encounter - acknowledging that officers may utilize varying levels of authority during the course of an encounter. Along the FAS, Klinger acknowledges police arrest (of one or more persons, more being equivalent to a higher authority rating), taking reports, imposing solutions, discussing situations and suggesting solutions, and taking no action but to gather further information.

One issue to raise with Klinger's (1996) FAS is that one could say it measures more

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

than one dimension of behavior. While conceptually the idea of police use of authority IS a behavioral dimension, the way Klinger operationalizes this scale poses some question as to whether or not he captures one or more dimensions on the continuum. As mentioned, the second level of his scale is labeled as 'discuss, etc.' and roughly 60% of the encounters fell here; this was the highest level of 'authority' utilized in these encounters. However, in Klinger's brief description of this category, he states that included in the 'discuss, etc.' category are cases where the officer took some form of action, including counseling, offering referrals, providing some assistance, and giving advice (Klinger, 1996: 399 - 401). In fact, defining part of this category as 'providing assistance' reflects something very different from what Klinger wants to measure with the formal 'authority' scale. Providing counseling, and in some cases maybe offering referrals and advice might be similarly problematic.[10]

Aside from tapping into more than one dimension, while the behaviors identified in the 'discuss' category are less authoritative (and as I've argued, many are *not* authoritative in nature at all) than those behaviors *above them* on the continuum, some of these behaviors in the 'discuss' category are not equal in their authoritativeness. For example, gathering information, which may come in the form of questioning or performing a search, might be considered as more authoritative than simply offering advice or counseling (also in this category). This means that the behaviors in the 'discuss' category are not equally less or more authoritative than actions above them or below them, respectively, on the authority scale.

[10]Some may contend that even the provision of support is still 'authoritative' in nature because it is being administered by an agent who specializes in, and represents, social control. I still believe these types of behaviors might be best identified as those falling into another dimension - assistance and support.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

As a final point to make in regards to Klinger's (1996) formal authority scale, I return to the same issue one could take up with the measure created by Sykes and Brent (1983) and with the measure created by Smith (1987). These measures do not account for possible combinations of the actions they rank - whether they are ranked in terms of authority utilized by the police or severity to the citizens encountered. While Klinger illustrates well what each level of behavior means practically and conceptually, he does not account for varying levels to occur within encounters - when one is measuring the "quantity" or "amount" of something this issue is an important one. To Klinger's credit, he does admit this fault in his work. An officer who threatens, warns and arrests a suspect has utilized more authority than an officer who only arrests - this would not be accounted for on Klinger's FAS. Other possible combinations, resulting in the actual use of more authority, would not be represented either. Still, this work significantly advances the field in that it teases out other police actions - apart from the arrest action - and in that it presents a more in depth conceptualization of a behavioral dimension (use of authority) and attempts to operationalize this dimension along a continuum – an important step away from dichotomizing behavior.

My dissertation research will capture several different police actions and form composite measures of police authority and support. I will construct measures which capture the 'quantity' of authority and support by taking into account, for example, the possibility that more than one authoritative action could occur toward any one juvenile. I will assign numerical values to independent police actions as they represent higher or lower levels of authority and support, respectively, and then sum these values to create continua. These

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

actions will also be collapsed to form categories that, like Klinger's, capture the most authoritative action. For a description of the types of police actions that will be captured and utilized to measure these behavioral constructs, see Appendix A.

CHAPTER THREE

A THEORETICAL ACCOUNT OF POLICE BEHAVIOR

The next section of this paper will discuss in detail the theoretical frameworks being used to explain police decision-making with juveniles. First, I will discuss the psychological approach and how it applies to my research. Second, I will discuss the sociological approach which has typically been applied to police decision-making with juveniles, and with citizens generally.

Psychological Explanations of Police Behavior

Psychological or individual theories of police behavior utilize as explanatory variables the attributes of individual officers such as personal characteristics (race, sex, age),

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

background characteristics (education, length of service, training), and attitudes about their work, their supervisors and the citizens that they serve. These models might also utilize personality type and officer mood as factors to explain police behavior. Generally speaking, the thesis for this approach is that individual officers who share particular characteristics or attitudes will display similar patterns of behavior. That is, they will respond to similar situations in a like manner because it is something about the individual that shapes behavior. As these individual characteristics vary, proponents of this approach expect to see this variation reflected in varying patterns of behavior. This makes intuitive sense inasmuch as one expects to see differences in behavior with variation in these factors – that, for example, male officers, educated officers, white officers behave differently than female officers, less educated officers, and minority officers.

Personal and Background Characteristics

There has been a significant amount of research on how personal characteristics shape police behavior, though none of this research focuses on police behavior with juveniles. For this reason, research on police encounters with adults will serve as the basis for hypothesizing about how officer characteristics might influence police use of authority and provision of support and assistance toward juveniles. In the following pages I will review the literature on and hypothesize about the effects of the following officer characteristics: race, sex, training, education, and length of service.

Sex

A more than modest body of literature has developed on the influence of officer sex on behavior. Propositions about female officers differing from male officers revolve around

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

more than their genetic makeup[11]. Rather, it is hypothesized that differences in behaviors (as well as attitudes) might be observed and expected inasmuch as women are socialized in life in generally different ways than men (Gilligan, 1982). In our society women are socialized to be more nurturing, caring, and less aggressive overall than men.

In addition to having these different life experiences[12], women have traditionally been excluded from the police occupation. The first woman police officer was not sworn in until 1910 and it was not until 1972 that female officers obtained the right to an equal opportunity in law enforcement (Martin, 1989: 363). Before that time, and most likely for a while afterwards, female officers were placed in special units which usually dealt with problems involving juveniles and families - this was deemed the 'appropriate' role for women in policing. The most widely cited reason for their exclusion from street level patrol work revolves around physical differences - that female officers might not be physically able to defend themselves and deal with the situations they confront (Bloch and Anderson, 1974; Martin, 1980; Sherman, 1975). When one looks at the history of women in policing, at least three types of exclusion are apparent. First, women were wholly excluded from the occupation of policing. Then, once accepted into the occupation, female officers were not allowed to be street officers. Finally, they were excluded from the traditional police culture.

[11]As Morash and Greene (1986) argue, sometimes it IS left to the reader/writer to assume that biological differences do account for variation in behavior – and too often other explanations (such as socialization differences) are not pursued (p. 233).

[12]When I say 'different life experiences' and 'socialized differently', I speak in general terms and describe general patterns of socialization. I do not refute the possibility that females drawn into policing for career purposes may not be representative of females generally. In fact, this may explain why there appear to be few attitudinal and behavioral differences between male and female officers.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

As a result of their socialization and their exclusion from traditional police roles and values, women might be expected to have different perspectives on human relations and they might question the conventional crime fighting role of the police (Worden, 1993). Consequently, it is expected that female officers would exhibit different behavioral patterns than their male counterparts. Before I discuss propositions about these expected differences, I will first review empirical evidence comparing male and female officers.

Perhaps the most comprehensive research to date on the behavior of male and female officers utilizes observational data on male and female officers in Washington DC (Bloch and Anderson, 1974). Overall, this research finds many similarities in the way male and female officers work. Two exceptions noted by the authors are, first, that male officers make slightly more discretionary stops, and second, male officers make more arrests than their female counterparts. The fact that female officers produce proportionately fewer arrests than male officers could mean that women are not taking the initiative or that women are not as comfortable with using their authority as men. It could also mean that "female officers handle situations better, making arrest unnecessary" (Martin, 1989: 368); for example, female officers might be better able to get voluntary compliance than male officers. It is interesting that while female officers made fewer arrests, they obtained very similar conviction rates to male officers (Bloch and Anderson, 1974).[13] Similarly, Worden (1989) also finds that female officers, on average, make significantly fewer suspicion stops than males and this too might

[13]This evidence may suggest that female officers are more careful in using their authority and use it only when necessary and when the chance of conviction is higher.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

be interpreted as evidence that female officers take less initiative than male officers.[14]

Other research on the behavioral patterns of male and female officers, when taken together, is not conclusive. It might be the case that male and female officers behave mostly the same but in particular situations or for certain types of behavior, they respond differently. For example, Grennan (1987) tested and found support for the hypothesis that females would be less likely to use deadly force during a violent confrontation. So while there is some evidence that female officers behave differently than their male counterparts, it seems to be more the case that male and female officers display similar patterns of behavior (Snortum and Beyers, 1983; Bloch and Anderson, 1974; Sichel et. al., 1978).

There are some limitations to the research on male and female officers. The most important problem may be that most studies tend to focus on whether or not female officers conform with the way male officers work (see Morash and Greene, 1986), as if the 'male' way is the right way. For example, take the finding that female officers make fewer arrests (Bloch and Anderson, 1974). Are female officers more or less efficient as a result of this? The answer is not clear. We could interpret this finding as evidence of females being more or less efficient depending on what we want to find. It may be that female officers have a better ability to calm situations, making arrest unnecessary.

In addition, most research fails to provide a "representative sampling of police tasks and situations" (Morash and Greene, 1986: 248). Rather, these comparison studies tend to focus on violent occurrences and dangerous situations. Yet, police scholars have reported that these types of situations are infrequent - that the majority of an officer's day is consumed

[14]Worden utilizes data collected for the Police Services Study - this, like Bloch and Anderson's

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

with maintaining order (Wilson, 1968), not with handling violent and dangerous situations. One might argue that these situations are the point of contention and therefore should be studied. That is, research has looked where it was most likely to find differences. Regardless, the focus of the research does not accurately represent police work as we know it. For this reason we do not see research which compares male and female officers on the provision of assistance and support. There is some evidence that female officers are better listeners, more understanding, and more sympathetic (Bloch and Anderson 1974, Martin, 1989)- but this knowledge is derived from supervisor and citizen ratings which may be tainted by the ways in which females are generally viewed in our society.

How might we expect men and women to differ in their uses of authority and support toward juveniles? It is unfortunate that we do not have any prior research on how male and female officers behave toward juveniles; most research on police-juvenile interactions focuses on situational factors and how they influence police decision making (Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman, et. al., 1978). However, given what we know about how females are socialized in our society and how they have been excluded from the police profession, it is expected that female officers will behave differently than male officers toward juveniles by, first, rejecting the traditional role of police, and second, by not rejecting their more nurturing and understanding perspective of humanity. By rejecting the traditional police role, it is expected that females will reject the hard- nosed, aggressive approach to policing and be less likely to take authoritative actions in their encounters with juvenile suspects and disputants than their male counterparts. Because this research focuses on explaining police behavior

---

data were collected through social observation of police patrol officers.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

toward *juveniles*, and not toward citizens generally, one might argue that there is an even greater likelihood that females will behave differently than males. Inasmuch as females tend to be the primary caretaker of children in American households, one might expect them to be more understanding, patient, sympathetic, and generally more maternal toward those juveniles they encounter. It is expected that females will be more likely to offer some form of support or assistance to the juveniles they encounter, and that they will be *more likely* to provide support (and take supportive actions).

Race

Similar to the struggles faced by female officers, minorities have also not been readily accepted into the police profession or the police subculture. Not only have minorities been an excluded group, historically the police occupation is riddled with racial tension. During the civil rights movement, police practices proved to be an important issue as police officers became a symbol for "white power and authority" (Walker, 1992: 21). Throughout this period incidents of police brutality were the impetus for numerous riots in American cities. And it appeared as though the police played much more of a role in 'policing' the lives of minority citizens than white citizens (Bayley and Mendelsohn, 1969). Subsequently, police-minority relations in the 1960s and 70s had reached their lowest point. It was during this turbulent time that minorities began to enter the police occupation, and they were not readily accepted by white officers into the profession.

Given this background (exclusion of minorities from the police occupation and the turbulent past involving minorities and the police), one might expect to find some behavioral differences to emerge between white and minority officers. Extant research on racial

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

differences and whether or not patterns emerge many depend on the type(s) of police behavior being examined. Research on the arrest decision indicates that officer race has no influence (Smith and Klein, 1983), however, research examining other types of police behavior paint a slightly different picture of the role of officer race. For example, Worden (1989) examines police dispositions in traffic stops and finds that minority officers are more likely than their white counterparts to take some form of action (mediation, separation, counseling, or coercion). Also, in an examination of the use of deadly force, Fyfe (1981) reports that minority officers are more likely to discharge their firearms than white officers. This might be evidence that they are more likely to use authority, but this might possibly be explained instead by the geographic assignments of minority and white officers. Minority officers might be assigned more often than white officers to areas of low SES where more crime occurs and where the use of deadly force is necessary on a more frequent basis. Like research on the influence of officer gender on decision-making, research on the influence of officer race is inconsistent or at least open to interpretation.

One would expect minority officers to have better insight into the perspective of minority communities. Minority officers might be more aware of the potentially damaging and long-lasting effects that the misuse of police authority has on police-community relations. Consequently, and despite findings reviewed earlier which suggest minorities might be more likely to use their authority, minority officers might reject the hard-nosed aggressive approach traditionally associated with policing and utilize their authority more sparingly. Minority officers might also be more aware of the importance of police service provision and they might be more likely to offer assistance and support to those they

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

encounter. Again, there is no prior research on how minority officers might differ from white officers in the handling of *juveniles*, however, one might expect minority officers to have more insight into the views of minority youth. This might result in the use of less authority toward juveniles because minority officers might be more aware of the negative consequences of using too much coercion in these situations. Minority officers may be more likely to provide supportive actions to juvenile troublemakers as they might be more aware of the need for, and importance of, such actions than white officers.

Training and Experience

Police behavior toward juveniles may also vary with the amount of training that individual officers have received. Police training might be thought of in two ways: on the job experience (or length of service) and formal on the job training in specific areas (e.g., training in handling domestic disputes or training in handling juvenile problems). Both of these forms of training increase an officer's knowledge of police work and may increase the number of tools in their arsenal for handling situations, and they (length of service and formal training) may have similar or different effects on officer behavior. You might expect that younger, less experienced, officers would be more active on the street while more experienced officers might be either burned out or more accepting of the fact that police work is not the action packed job they once thought it to be. There is some evidence to support this hypothesis. Worden (1989) finds that more experienced officers make both fewer traffic and suspicion stops (692), and Meyers et.al. (1989) find evidence that police with more experience are more likely to cite juvenile drivers with blood alcohol levels at .02 . This evidence is not conclusive as other studies examining police use of force and other

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

more discretionary behaviors have not found differences between less and more experienced officers (see Freidrich, 1980; Homant and Kennedy, 1985; and Worden, 1989 for examples). Still one might expect that officers with fewer years on the job would be more likely to take authoritative actions and use more authority than officers who have learned through experience how to handle situations using only the amount of authority necessary. Officers with less experience might be less likely to fully realize the importance of helping citizens (they may not yet recognize this latent part of their job), so they may be less likely to provide support and assistance to juveniles than officers with more years on the job.

Police formal training might have similar effects on officer behavior. Police who are trained in mediation, for example, might be better at handling situations without having to resort to commands and threats or more formal responses like arrest, while officers without such training may be quicker to use these more authoritative tactics and thus use them more often simply because it is the only way they know. Officers trained in handling problems with youth might be more likely to handle situations in a non-authoritative, perhaps supportive, way.

The most comprehensive studies of police juvenile interactions are based on data collected in 1966 (Black and Reiss, 1970) and 1970 (Lundman et.al., 1978) and these findings may not hold true for contemporary police (Worden and Myers, 1999). Since 1970 police agencies have experienced a paradigm shift: many are now operating under the rubric of community policing (or they are in transition), and they train officers on the concepts and principles of community policing. In comparison with earlier studies of police juvenile interactions, one would expect contemporary police to initiate more contacts with juveniles

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

as they may be directed to pay more attention to minor offenses. Many juvenile offenses are expected to be of a minor legal nature and they might attract more police attention today than they did three decades ago. One might expect that officers who had more training on specific topics (like community policing, problem solving, or handling problematic youth) would be better equipped to handle incidents informally and they might use less authority overall towards juveniles. In addition, one would expect that officers receiving more training might be more likely to provide outright support and assistance to juveniles as these officers may have learned the value of these types of behaviors.

Assignment

Aside from training patrol officers on the concepts and principles of community policing, many departments now have community policing specialists. These specialists might approach their work as a police officer differently than traditional officers. One would expect that these community officers would be more on board with a community policing philosophy and better trained in community policing than patrol officers. Community policing espouses, among other things, that police agencies improve the quality of police services, and that officers pay attention to minor 'quality of life' offenses, initiate more interactions with the community, and be more creative with their decision-making (Goldstein, 1987; Goldstein, 1990; Kelling, 1985; Wilson and Kelling, 1982).[15] Specialized community policing officers might be more likely to realize the value of support and assistance in their line of work (especially with kids) and they may be less likely to use

[15]There are, of course different types or styles of community policing which may or may not include certain principles of community policing – see Mastrofski, Worden and Snipes (1995) for a brief discussion of this.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

authoritative actions and more likely to provide support to those juvenile suspects with whom they interact.

Education

Education is somewhat similar to formal police training in that it is supposed to increase knowledge - though the content is different (i.e., it is more general). While formal police training might increase skills for handling specific police situations (e.g., mediation training, community policing training, training on handling domestic disputes or incidents with juveniles) increases in college education might affect officers' perspectives on human nature and cultural differences, perhaps making them more understanding of the problematic situations and people that they confront. College educated officers might be better able to balance a dual role of authority and support. That is, they might be better able to conceive of their role in terms of not only enforcers of the law, but also in terms of helping people (Worden, 1990: 567). They also may be more at ease communicating with all types of people, regardless of their background. And they may simply have a larger vocabulary, and they may be better communicators - having something Muir (1977) would refer to as the 'gift of gab'.

One might expect that the differences college education brings to police work may be manifested in behavior directly. Officers with more education might be better at making decisions, they may have more options to choose from (or at least realize their array of choices) when handling problems with youth. Because of a better grasp of cultural differences and the ability to better communicate with people from all backgrounds, officers with college educations might be less likely to take authoritative actions than officers who

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

are not college educated. For the same reasons, they may also be more likely to provide support to juvenile troublemakers.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Summary of Expectations for Personal and Background Characteristics:

Use of Authority

Sex -- It is expected that female officers will utilize less authority and take fewer authoritative actions than their male counterparts.

Race – It is expected that minority officers will be less likely to take authoritative actions (and less likely to make arrests) than their white counterparts.

Training – It is expected that officers with more training on specific topics that might expand their repertoire of responses, like concepts and principles of community policing, will be less likely to take more authoritative actions than officers without or with less training.

Length of Service - It is expected that as officer length of service increases they will be less likely to take more authoritative actions.

Education - It is expected that college educated officers will use less authority and be less likely to take authoritative actions than officers without college educations.

Community Policing Assignment - It is expected that officers who are community specialists will be less likely to resort to authoritative actions than patrol officers.

Provision of Support/Assistance

Sex --It is expected that female officers will be more likely to offer some form of support and assistance, and that they will be more likely to take supportive actions than their male counterparts.

Race – It is expected that minority officers will be more likely than their white counterparts to provide supportive actions.

Training – It is expected that officers with more training on selected topics might be more likely to provide assistance and support to juveniles than those officers with less training.

Length of Service - It is expected that as officer length of service increases they will be more likely to provide support and assistance.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Education - It is expected that college educated officers will be more likely to take supportive actions than officers without college educations.

Community Policing Assignment - It is expected that officers who are community specialists will be more likely to provide support and assistance than regular patrol officers.

Officer Attitudes

Psychological explanations of police behavior also hold that attitudes shape behavior. There is undoubtedly an intuitive appeal to this working hypothesis. Simply stated, it is only logical to expect that one's behavior would reflect one's attitudes; that one's attitudinal proclivities would manifest themselves in one's behavior. A modest amount of research has focused on the link between officer attitudes and behavior. While this research is inconclusive at best, it suggests that there are weak, if any, relationships between attitudes and behavior. However, rather than posit that there is no attitude - behavior link (and there is not enough evidence to reach this conclusion), some police scholars assert that the relationship between the two may be more complex than originally thought (see Worden, 1992 for example). It might be, for example, that officer characteristics and situational characteristics interact with officer attitudes; obscuring the relationship between attitudes and behavior.

Much of the research that has developed on officer attitudes slots officers into typologies based on their attitudinal propensities and, in some cases, their behavior. What can be taken from this literature are the attitudinal dimensions that police scholars have identified and utilized to describe police officers as well as the implied relationship between attitudes and behavior. Inasmuch as one would expect officer attitudes to manifest

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

themselves in officer behavior, these attitudinal dimensions might be used to hypothesize about police use of authority and provision of support toward juveniles. For example, Susan White (1972) developed a four-fold typology of police officers based on both their perceptions of their role (as police officers) and their behavior. White describes officers' attitudinal values and their behavioral actions as being either "particularistic" or "universalistic". Officers were considered to have particularistic values if they assumed inequalities and dissimilarities exist amongst their clientele (White, 1972: 69). Officers described as having universalistic values are those who believe that, for police matters, all clients are alike and should be treated the same (White, 1972: 69). White also classifies *actions* in terms of these same concepts. Officers who *act particularistically* are those who respond to the 'peculiarities' of those clients she confronts - they respond on an individual basis, while officers *acting universalistically* are only interested in efficiently using law enforcement techniques across the range of cases that confront them - they do not respond to cases on an individualized basis (White, 1972: 69). However, with such a broad picture of 'values'(and behavior) as they are described by White, it is difficult to specifically measure these concepts (particularistic and universalistic values) and apply them to research on how attitudes might influence behavior.

Similar to, but more specific than, the typology by Susan White (1972), Muir (1977), and Brown (1988) also created typologies of police officers based on their attitudinal (and in some cases behavioral) tendencies. In an effort to describe what makes a 'good policeman', Muir (1977) classifies patrol officers based on two attitudinal dimensions: how they view human nature (tragic or cynic perspective) and their outlook on the use of coercion

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

(integrated or conflicted morality). Officers with a tragic perspective of human nature are those who have a generally good view of mankind and who understand the nature and causes of human suffering. Officers with a cynic perspective are not sympathetic to human suffering – they believe everyone has complete control over their actions at all times[16]. In creating a four-fold typology, Muir examines these two perspectives on human nature along with officers' perspectives on the use of coercive tactics. Officers who are comfortable using coercive tactics are said to have an 'integrated morality' and officers who have a conflicted outlook on the use of coercion have a 'conflicted morality'. Muir (1977) describes a good police officer as one who has both passion and perspective; one with an integrated morality and a tragic perspective - these officers, *professionals*, understand the nature of human suffering and use coercion proportionately.

Views of Citizenry

Because Muir's 'tragic and cynic perspectives' are based on views of mankind and human nature, one might draw some connections between cynicism, for example, and views of citizenry. Following Muir's (1977) lead, Worden (1989) postulates that "officers with a cynical outlook may be disinclined to believe that citizens are respectful and cooperative" (688). One might also suppose that officers with a cynical outlook might believe that citizens would be unlikely to call the police if they saw something suspicious or provide

[16]There are some similarities between White's description of particularistic/universalistic values and the tragic/cynic perspectives. Tragics have a positive view of human nature and understand suffering and one might expect officers with these outlooks to also have particularistic values which would allow them to respond to cases and people on an individualized basis (according to their particular need and situation). Muir's cynics are not sympathetic attitudinally to human suffering and one might expect these officers to have universalistic values that make them think of all people in the same light, not deserving of individualized treatment (at least in terms of their job

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

information about some criminal activity or suspicious person if the police were to ask them. It has been hypothesized, but not empirically confirmed, that officers with negative views of citizens might enforce the law more vigorously (Worden: 1989). And, Worden (1992) tests and finds support for the hypothesis that officers who tend to view citizens as "unappreciative at best and hostile and abusive at worst" are more likely to use both reasonable and unreasonable force (34, 52-53). It is expected, then, that officers with negative views of citizens and police-citizen cooperation will utilize more authority in their encounters with juveniles than officers with generally positive views of citizens. Likewise, officers with negative views of citizens might view juveniles as less deserving of assistance, support, and comfort and perform fewer of these types of behaviors than officers with more positive views.

Aggressiveness and Selectivity

Two other attitudinal dimensions, aggressiveness and selectivity, are examined by Michael Brown (1988). *Aggressiveness* is described as "taking the initiative on the street to control crime and a preoccupation with order that legitimizes the use of illegal tactics" (Brown, 1988: 223). We might characterize officers who believe in aggressively patrolling, stopping cars and running frequent license checks as being attitudinally 'aggressive'. That is, they have a favorable view of a proactive, 'aggressive' approach to police work. *Selectivity* "distinguishes between patrol officers who believe that all laws should be enforced and those who consciously assign felonies a higher priority" (Brown, 1988: 223). Officers who believe there are, at times, reasons for not always enforcing the law might be

---

as patrol officers).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

said to have selective attitudes toward law enforcement.

Brown (1988) argues that "beliefs toward aggressiveness and selectivity are the core elements" of an officer's operational style – and how they behave on the street is tempered by these attitudes (223). It is expected that officers who are aggressive attitudinally will also be more aggressive behaviorally. This might have implications for officers' use of authority and support. One might expect officers who have aggressive attitudes to exhibit more authoritative actions (including being more likely to arrest) and less supportive actions than officers who reportedly have less aggressive attitudes about their work. However, it is also possible that officers who are attitudinally aggressive may pro-actively initiate more encounters that are of a minor legal nature and which subsequently result in little more than an interrogation of the juvenile in question. So, if we were to compare these proactive officers to their less aggressive counterparts, we could find that they use less authority in the aggregate.

Officers with selective attitudes about law enforcement might be expected to invoke the law in only the most serious cases (and most juvenile encounters are expected to be of a minor legal nature). It is expected that officers who have more selective attitudes about enforcing the law will be less likely to arrest juvenile suspects. In reserving arrest for the most serious cases, selective officers may utilize less authoritative actions during a single encounter. For example, where an officer who is not selective may simply make an arrest, the selective officer may try suggesting or persuading a juvenile to do something, this may then escalate into questioning or to using different types of threats (e.g., threats of arrest, citations, etc.). In doing this, selective officers might utilize a higher level of authority than

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

non-selective officers (those who believe the law should be enforced vigorously, and at all times) - but the highest level of authority (arrest) may not be reached as often.

These two attitudinal dimensions have some relevance to supportive behaviors as well. Michael Brown (1988) types his ‘service style’ officers as not aggressive but selective in their enforcement. Brown further describes service style officers as those who “argue that the police should take a positive role in assisting people to solve their problems" (236). Based on Brown’s findings, one might expect then that officers with these attitudinal proclivities would be more likely to take supportive actions and less likely to take authoritative actions than officers who do not fit this attitudinal mold.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Role Orientation

Police officers also vary in their beliefs about their role. For example, some officers believe their role is defined strictly in law enforcement terms. They believe the police mandate is to fight crime and that handling minor infractions does not constitute 'real' police work (Brown, 1988: 225). These officers are said to have a 'narrow' conception of their role. Other officers conceive of their role in 'broader' terms. While they agree that enforcing the law is important, they also believe that handling minor violations and dealing with disorder is an important and necessary aspect of their work (though they may secretly trivialize such matters) (Brown, 1988: 233). In addition, officers who willingly accept community policing initiatives and accept as part of their role maintaining order and more contemporary police tasks (dealing with litter and trash, etc.) are said to have a more expansive view of their role. The work of Brown (1988), White (1972) and Muir (1977) each present us with four different 'styles' or 'types' of officers, who vary in their role orientation (also see Worden, 1995). Within each four-fold typology, two types of officers define their role in narrow, law enforcement terms. For example, White's (1972) 'tough cops' and 'crime fighters' view their role in a narrow law enforcement manner. Brown's (1988) 'old style crime fighters' are similar - they see themselves as enforcers of the law and while minor infractions must be dealt with from time to time, they do not see maintaining order as central to their role.

Officers who are considered to have a more expansive role conception might attitudinally favor and accept community policing initiatives. One might expect officers with favorable attitudes toward community policing (broad role conception) to be less likely to make arrests as community policing proponents advocate for alternatives to arrest.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Mastrofski et. al. (1995) found some support for this hypothesis. Worden tests (in two separate analyses), but does not empirically confirm, the hypotheses that officers with a narrow conception of their role will be more likely to use force, and make more suspicion stops (1992; 1989, respectively). It is expected that officers who have a broad role orientation (they accept order maintenance and community policing tasks) will utilize less authority toward juveniles, and be less likely to make arrests than those officers who view their role in more narrow, law enforcement terms. One might also expect that officers with a broad conception of their role would be more likely to offer assistance and comfort to juveniles, as they might be more likely to include these behaviors in their role definition. That is, because they see their role in broader terms, they may also see their responsibilities in broader terms and hence be more likely to embrace and apply assistance and supportive behaviors.

Assisting Citizens

Finally, descriptions of officer 'types' and 'styles' also reveal attitudinal propensities toward 'assisting' citizens. For example, White's (1972) 'problem solvers' and Muir's (1977) 'professional' are described in terms that resemble what one would expect to hear in descriptions of social workers. These types of officers are sincerely interested in helping citizens with their problems and they have a strong desire to not just be part of the process, but to see problems through to the end. In some ways, this attitudinal dimension is similar to role orientation. Officers with a broad role orientation might be more likely to include 'assisting citizens' in their role conception. However, inasmuch as role orientation is conceptualized in terms of the situations in which police feel citizens can legitimately ask

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

the police to intervene, attitudes about 'assistance' may be distinct in that they are about the actions police might take while providing service. One might expect that officers who believe assisting citizens is an important aspect of their role would be more likely to offer assistance and comfort to juveniles - and they might also offer more assistance than their counterparts (i.e., officers who do not agree that assisting citizen is important). They may also be less likely to use authoritative actions as they recognize the possibility of solving problems with assistance and support rather than with coercion.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Summary of Expectations for Officer Attitudes[17]:

Use of Authority

Cynicism – It is expected that officers with more negative views of citizens will use more authority and will be more likely to make arrests than officers with more positive views of citizens.

Aggressiveness – It is expected that officers who favor an aggressive style will use more authority and will be more likely to make arrests than officers who do not favor such an aggressive style. However, one should allow for the competing hypothesis that officers who favor an aggressive approach may initiate more encounters with juveniles that are of a minor legal nature and involve little more than questioning the juvenile, hence it may appear in the aggregate that these officers use lower levels of authority.

Selectivity – Officers with more selective attitudes about enforcing the law are expected to utilize less authority and be less likely to make arrests than their less selective counterparts.

Role Orientation - Officers with a more expansive view of their role (i.e., they include minor violations and disorders as part of their role) are expected to utilize less authority and to be less likely to make arrests than officers with a narrow role conception.

Selective and Not Aggressive - Officers who attitudinally favor selectivity and who do not favor an aggressive approach are expected to be less likely to take authoritative actions than their counterparts (officers who do not fit this attitudinal mold).

Assistance – Officers who believe assisting citizens is important are expected to be less likely to take authoritative actions than those officers who do not recognize the importance of assisting citizens.

[17]As you will notice, some attitudes are expected to have an effect on officers' use of authority but not on officers' use of assistance and comfort - and likewise, one attitude is expected to have an effect on officers' use of assistance and comfort but not on authority. This is because the two dimensions of behavior being examined are so different from one another that you would not expect each attitudinal dimension to have measurable effects on each one. See Frank and Brandl (1991) for more on selecting attitudes that are expected to predict 'specific behaviors' - attitudinal dimensions must be relevant to the target behavior (85).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Provision of Support/Assistance

Cynicism – It is expected that officers with negative views toward citizens will be less likely to offer juveniles assistance and comfort than officers with more positive views.

Role Orientation – Officers with a more expansive view of their role are expected to be more likely to offer juveniles assistance and comfort than those officers with a less expansive role definition.

Assistance – Officers who believe assisting citizens is important are expected to offer more assistance and comfort to juveniles than officers who do not believe assisting citizens is an important aspect of their work.

Aggressiveness - It is expected that officers who favor a more aggressive approach to policing will be less likely to take supportive actions than those officers who do not favor an aggressive approach.

Selective and Not Aggressive - Officers who attitudinally favor selectivity and who do not favor an aggressive approach are expected to be more likely to offer support and to offer more support than their counterparts (officers who do not fit this attitudinal mold).

One limitation to applying these propositions to police-juvenile interactions, and this limitation occurs frequently when one is doing secondary data analysis, is that these attitudes do not measure officer attitudes specific to juveniles. Rather, they are general attitudes about citizens and one cannot be sure if officer attitudes about adults and juveniles are the same or different, and if these officer attitudes reflect one or both of those two populations.

I will next discuss the application of the sociological approach, and situational factors, to my research.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Sociological Explanations of Police Behavior

Sociological or situational theories of police behavior turn to factors in the officer's immediate situation to explain their behavior. The underlying assumption is that people respond to the social structure of the situation. There are an infinite number of possibly influential factors in one's environment. A large body of research has accumulated on this subject and this research supports the hypothesis that police respond to the situation with which they are presented (see Smith and Visher (1981), for an example). Still, the relationships may not be so simple and one might hypothesize that officer attitudes and personal characteristics might interact with the situational environment, as suggested by some schema theorists.[18] This possibility will be discussed in greater detail in the next section.

In police-citizen encounters, there are some situational cues that we expect officers to be attuned to when making decisions e.g., offense seriousness and the amount of evidence; this grouping of factors has been labeled 'legal' factors. Other factors which might reflect a suspect's social status or what police might perceive as their "subversive capability", and for which effects on police decision-making are undesirable, are extra-legal factors (Black and Reiss, 1967: 8). A person's social status includes those characteristics that 'one carries with them from situation to situation, such as their sex, age, race, demeanor, ethnic, or social class status' (Black and Reiss, 1967: 9).

Highlighted by the sociological approach (as its applied to policing research) are

[18]For example, officers who are attitudinally different or have different role orientations might respond differently to the same stimulus (e.g., seriousness of the offense).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

hypotheses which utilize these 'legal' and 'extralegal' factors to explain police decision-making. These hypotheses are valid inasmuch as one expects individuals to respond to the situation to which they are presented. In these next pages I will review the literature on the effects of legal and extra-legal factors and deduce propositions about their expected influences on police decision-making with juveniles. I will tread only lightly into research on policing juveniles as I have already reviewed this literature in Chapter One. My hypotheses stem from the literature on police discretion generally as well as literature on policing juveniles.

Legal Factors

A significant amount of research has focused on the influence of legal factors on police behavior. Legal factors might include the seriousness of the offense, the amount of evidence available to the officer, whether or not the juvenile appears to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs, and whether or not the victim requests that the police take, or not take, some kind of action. Research testing hypotheses on the influence of these factors confirm that they do have a significant impact on police decision-making.

Extant research on policing juveniles and on policing generally suggests that police are responsive to offense seriousness and evidence strength. When the offense is serious and the evidence is strong the police are more likely to utilize their authority by making an arrest and/or by using force[19] (the latter pertains to adult subjects only) (Berk and Loseke, 1981;

[19] I would only add that these findings about the effect of offense seriousness and evidence strength are true for examinations of police-citizen interactions generally, where no particular subset of cases are analyzed, as well as for analysis of domestic incidents.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Black and Reiss, 1970; Friedrich, 1980; Lundman et.al., 1978; Smith and Visher, 1981; Worden, 1992; Worden and Myers, 1999; Worden and Pollitz, 1984). These findings have obvious implications for police use of authority. It is expected that when the offense is more serious and when the evidence is strong, the police are likely to use more authority toward a juvenile than when the offense is of a minor legal nature and the evidence is weak. That is, they will be more likely to make an arrest and more likely to utilize commands, threats to cite or arrest, and investigative tactics. One would expect police would be more likely to use any kind of authority at all, and also to use more of it.

Hypotheses about the impact of offense seriousness and evidence strength on police use of support and assistance actions are not as readily derived as those on police use of authority. Inasmuch as those juveniles involved in more serious encounters and against whom the evidence is strong might be deemed less deserving of support and assistance, one might expect that these juvenile suspects would receive less support and comfort from officers than those involved in less serious offenses and/or where the evidence is not as strong. However, one should also allow for the possibility that juveniles involved in more serious encounters and for whom the evidence is strong could also be regarded as 'most in need' of assistance and support, possibly evoking more of these police actions.

Especially in cases involving juveniles, officers might be expected to consider whether or not a suspect appears to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs. While possession of drugs is an offense for both younger and older persons, possession of alcohol is an offense only for persons under the age of twenty-one. It might be expected, then, that a juvenile appearing to be under the influence of alcohol would be even more likely than an

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

adult, under the same circumstances, to have police authority used against them - whether it be an arrest or something else (for example, a threat or command). There has been little research on this matter. Previous research on the arrest decision in domestic violence cases supports the hypothesis that when the adult male is drinking the police are more likely to make an arrest (Worden and Pollitz, 1984; Berk and Loseke, 1981). Worden (1992), in his analysis of PSS data, finds that the police are more likely to use proper and improper force when a suspect is intoxicated. Worden and Myers (1999) report that when the suspect is a juvenile under the age of eighteen, and when they appear to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs, the police are *not* more likely to make an arrest than they are to simply release the juvenile[20]. Further, police are not any more likely to employ investigative tactics or use commands and threats under these circumstances; this too is unexpected. It could be that police officers are more likely to offer assistance and comfort in these situations, or at least when a juvenile is showing behavioral effects and is in need of assistance. Or maybe police officers do not view underage drinking as a serious offense, as they are aware that the majority of teens experiment with drinking and it is usually unrelated to more serious criminal acts.

As stated in chapter one, citizens do play a large role in the detection of juvenile crime. It is no surprise then that police respond to victims' requests. Research on police behavior generally, and with respect to juveniles, has supported the hypothesis that the police respond to victim requests regarding arrest (Black and Reiss, 1970; Smith and Visher, 1981;

[20]Only 6.8% showed any indication of intoxication and of those, for 3.8% there was an indication of alcohol or drug use but no behavioral effects. Still, one might expect the police to respond to this factor when the suspect is not of the legal age to be drinking.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Worden, 1989). Citizens do not determine police behavior, but they do have a significant impact. It is expected that when the complainant is present and requests that the suspect be arrested or that the suspect not be arrested, the police will be responsive to their requests. One might also expect officers to be more likely to utilize other forms of authority as well (e.g., commands, threats, investigative tactics). Inasmuch as a victim's request for arrest indicates to the officer that the complainant/victim is interested in punishing an offender and not helping the offender with their problem, one might expect that in this situation the officer may be less likely to offer some kind of assistance or comfort to the juvenile than if the victim made no such request. Further, if the victim requests that the juvenile not be arrested or at least makes it clear that they do not desire an arrest, the officer may be more likely to offer assistance - possibly because it is clear that the complainant is not interested in punishing the individual. If the complainant says nothing at all, the police may be unsure of where the complainant stands on the issue, but if complainants do make their wishes clear it may influence officers' decisions.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Summary of Expectations for Legal Factors:

Use of Authority

Seriousness – It is expected that police will be more likely to use authoritative actions when the offense is of a serious legal nature.

Evidence - It is expected that as the strength of the evidence increases, the amount of authority utilized will increase as well.

Use of Alcohol and/or Drugs - It is expected that the police will be more likely to take authoritative actions when the juvenile appears to be under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs than when a juvenile shows no such signs.

Victim Preference:
Requests Arrest - It is expected that when a complainant requests that the police arrest a juvenile the officer will be more likely to make an arrest and more likely to utilize other types of authority than when the citizen does not make this request.

Requests No Arrest - It is expected that when a complainant requests that the police do not arrest a juvenile suspect the officer will be less likely to make an arrest and less likely to use authority than if the citizen does not make this request.

Provision of Support/Assistance

Seriousness – It is expected that when the offense is a serious one the police will be less likely to offer support and assistance than when the offense is of a less serious nature.

Evidence - It is expected that as the strength of the evidence increases, the likelihood of police offering support and assistance toward the juvenile will decrease.

Use of Alcohol and/or Drugs - It is expected that the police will be less likely to offer support and assistance to a juvenile who is showing behavioral effects of being under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs.

Victim Preference:
Requests Arrest - It is expected that when a complainant requests that the police arrest a juvenile the officer will be less likely to offer support and assistance.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Requests No Arrest - However, it is expected that if a complainant requests that the police not arrest a juvenile the police will be more likely to offer support and assistance to the juvenile than if the victim had said nothing at all.

Research on the role of legal factors in police decision-making confirms that in cases involving adults *and* juveniles alike, police are influenced by these factors. Police are more likely to use authority and make an arrest when the offense is a serious one, when the evidence is strong, and when the victim prefers that an arrest be made. However, these legal factors do not determine police decisions. While they may play a substantial role, it is sometimes the case that when the offense is serious and the evidence strong, the police do not arrest. Likewise, at times, when the offense is of a less serious nature and the evidence is weak, the police use their discretion and make an arrest. Researchers look to extra-legal factors to help further explain police decision-making.

Extralegal Factors

The absence of concrete decision-making rules and guidelines to structure officer behavior, along with the observation that legal factors do not entirely determine the use of police discretion, has focused social scientists on the role that extra-legal factors play in decision-making. Attention to this issue has come about due to the realization that police officers bear the burden of an enormous amount of discretion and that they make decisions in a context with few informational cues available. It is in this light that one might expect situational characteristics that *are* readily observable to the officer - such as the suspect's

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

demeanor, race, sex, and level of wealth - to play a role in decision-making.

As patrol officers exercise their authority and handle situations "they are in an important sense dependent for cooperation upon those whom they have control" (Black and Reiss, 1967 p. 11). Research examining the influence of suspect demeanor, a reflection of cooperation, has produced consistent evidence that it has a substantial influence on police behavior. Police researchers have consistently found support for the expectation that citizens who are disrespectful toward the police are more likely to be arrested and more likely to have force used against them than those who are respectful or simply deferential. This finding is uniform across studies of police - juvenile encounters as well as police encounters with adults (Black and Reiss, 1967; Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman et.al., 1978; Piliavin and Briar, 1964; Smith and Visher, 1981; Worden, 1992; Worden and Shepard, 1996). While one's demeanor is termed an extralegal factor, one should, from an officer's perspective, give some consideration to what it really means to be disrespectful toward the police. We know that police use their arrest powers infrequently and that they do not arrest everyone that they legally could. If an officer is trying to decide which action is going to prevent a reoccurrence of a problem he may very well decide that the disrespectful person should be arrested more often than the respectful person under the same (or even more serious) circumstances. If someone is not deferring to police authority while the police are in their presence, why would the police believe that the person would defer when they leave - or that anything other than arrest will end the problem. In such a case, arrest may be used as a tactic to handle the situation because the police feel that any other outcome may not end the problem.

Inasmuch as disrespect denies legitimacy of police authority, it is expected that

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

juvenile suspects who are disrespectful toward the police will be more likely to be arrested and more likely to have other types of authority used toward them than suspects who are deferential. Further, inasmuch as disrespectful juveniles will be considered undeserving of police assistance and support, one would expect disrespectful juveniles would be less likely to receive any comfort or support from the police than suspects who are deferential.

While minorities and persons of low socioeconomic status make up a smaller proportion of America's population than whites and the middle class, they account for a large portion of prison and jail populations. It has been hypothesized that minorities and poor persons might be seen as being of lower social status than white, wealthy or even middle class persons, and inasmuch as their cultural backgrounds differ from those of the police, they may represent a threat to police authority. Police (and criminal justice agents throughout the system) might therefore treat minority, and poor suspects more harshly, and use more authority while interacting with them than with white, wealthier suspects. It has also been hypothesized that male suspects are treated more harshly than females. Researchers look to the relationships between these factors and the decisions made by criminal justice actors in an attempt to reveal racial, class, and gender biases.

Extant research on police decision-making with juveniles and on police decision-making generally has not revealed consistent evidence that race, class, and gender biases are operating. Early research suggested that minorities (juveniles and adults) were arrested at a higher rate but these findings were based on inadequate statistical methods which did not allow one to estimate the independent effects of race, or class, for example, by controlling for legal factors such as offense seriousness, evidence strength, or victim preferences (Black,

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1971; Black and Reiss, 1970; Piliavin and Briar, 1964). Some studies on police behavior generally (not focused on juveniles) have found that suspect race has an effect on police use of authority (whether it be arrest or use of force), independent of other situational factors (including offense seriousness, demeanor of the suspect, and victim preference) (Smith and Visher, 1981; Worden, 1992). Other research suggests that suspect race does not influence police behavior when other factors (such as neighborhood SES and the race of the complainant) are controlled (Friedrich, 1980; Smith, Visher and Davidson, 1984; Matstrofski, Worden, and Snipes, 1995)[21].

It has been suggested that the effects of race may be confounded with the effects of demeanor. Previous researchers found that minorities were more likely to be arrested because they were more often disrespectful, or because they were more likely to commit more serious offenses. Data collected through observation of police officers, focusing on police - juvenile interactions, does suggest that minorities are more likely to be disrespectful toward the police. It also suggests that minority complainants prefer arrest more than white complainants do - and consequently, minorities are more likely to be arrested (Lundman et. al., 1978; Piliavin and Briar, 1964). Research utilizing police-juvenile contact data found that minorities, males, and persons of lower socioeconomic status are more likely to be arrested (Sealock and Simpson, 1998), but these findings are born out of an analysis where complainant preference and suspect demeanor cannot be accounted for - these variables have

[21]Smith, Visher and Davidson (1984) report that *both black and white suspects* are more likely to arrested in low SES neighborhoods.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

proven to be important predictors in other studies.[22] More sophisticated analysis shows that when controlling for offense seriousness, evidence strength, suspects' race, and victim preference, suspects who fail the attitude test are more likely to be arrested; thus it is suspect demeanor driving police outcomes, not suspect race. Even when controlling for demeanor, race effects are sometimes still significant (i.e., they reach statistical significance) and minorities are more likely to be arrested (Smith and Visher, 1981), but it is more often the case that the race effects drop out.

If one assumes that racial biases are operating, one might expect that the police would take the problems of minority complainants less seriously than the problems of white complainants and be less likely to invoke their authority when the complainant is minority. At least one study shows that police *are* more likely to defer to the requests of white complainants than they are to the requests of minority complainants (Smith et. al., 1984), but other research provides conflicting evidence: that police are *more likely* to use authoritative actions when the complainant is a minority (even when they do not request an arrest) (Worden and Myers, 1999). Because the evidence is conflicting, as much as one might expect police to assign greater legitimacy to the complaints made by white citizens, it is expected that if the complainant is a minority the police will use less authority than if the complainant is white.

It is not clear what effect a suspect's gender has on police behavior. One might expect, because of how our society generally views females, that police would take on a more

[22]Wordes and Bynum (1995) find that racial biases exist in decisions about court referrals and custody - but they too were unable to control for victim preference and suspect demeanor.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

protective, patriarchal role than they would with juvenile boys and that they would be more lenient with female suspects (deviant females might be seen as in need of assistance rather than in need of punishment). One study finds that females are just as likely as males to be arrested (Smith and Visher, 1981), while another analysis of these same data reveal that females are less likely than males to have proper and improper force used against them (Worden, 1992). Worden and Myers (1999) find that males were more likely than females to be arrested when controlling for other situational factors, but they were no more likely to receive commands or be investigated (e.g., searched or questioned) The effect of suspect gender might well depend on the type(s) of police behavior being examined.[23] One might expect that female juveniles would be more likely recipients of support and assistance than their male counterparts.

Examinations of the effect of suspects' socioeconomic status on police behavior produce inconsistent findings as well: at times SES has had a significant influence on police decision-making (Smith, Visher and Davidson; 1984)[24], and at other times it has yielded null findings (Friedrich, 1980; Worden, 1992). More recent analysis of police-juvenile encounters, using data collected in 1996 and 1997, suggest that minority and low SES juveniles are no more likely than white and middle class juveniles to be arrested (see Worden

[23]The effects of gender might also depend on the class of offenses or problems being examined (Sealock and Simpson, 1998).

[24]Note: Smith Visher and Davidson used neighborhood SES as a substitute for suspect (or individual) SES - so if the suspect interacted with the police in a lower SES area, they were deemed to be at a lower level of wealth. It is a bit of a stretch to assume that because a person is in lower SES area they too are a person of low wealth - they are really showing neighborhood effects at the individual level.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

and Myers, 1999).

Some researchers suggest that it is the socio-economic status of the neighborhood where the encounter occurs, not of the juvenile or citizen, that influences police outcomes - suggesting that police may be biased against people in poor neighborhoods. Smith et.al. (1984) report that both black and white suspects encountered in a low SES neighborhood are more likely to be arrested than those encountered in a higher SES neighborhood. One might expect that juveniles (white or minority) encountered by the police in low SES neighborhoods and juveniles who appear to be of lower SES might be considered a greater threat to police authority and would therefore be more likely targets for police authority than those kids in middle and upper class neighborhoods. Inasmuch as this bias may carry over to police use of support and assistance, police might be less likely to offer assistance in lower SES neighborhoods and to lower SES kids.

The evidence to date on racial, class, and gender biases in police decision-making is debatable. Inasmuch as one expects police to be biased toward minorities and juveniles of lower SES, one might expect police to be less likely to offer support to minority and lower SES suspects than to white and middle/upper SES suspects However, one might also expect police to offer assistance and support to those juveniles who are more in need - and if this were the case minorities and lower SES kids might be more likely to get assistance (e.g., referrals to other agencies that might help them, information about youth centers, etc.) from the police.

Previous researchers have hypothesized about the effects of other situational or encounter characteristics that do not fall neatly into the legal or extra-legal categories. These

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

'other' situational factors might include (this in not meant to be an exhaustive list): who initiated the encounter (a complainant asking for police assistance or the officer); the number of citizens present during the encounter; the number of officers present during the encounter; whether the juvenile has any kind of weapon; wether there is a police supervisor present at the scene; and finally whether the officer has any prior knowledge about either the juvenile with whom he is interacting or of the location. In some analyses these factors have had a significant impact on behavior (they achieve some level of statistical significance).

One might expect, for example, that police might feel more comfortable using their authority when they intervene at a complainant's request, as the officer might feel a greater sense of legitimacy in the situation. An officer might also feel he has less legitimacy intervening and exerting authority when the encounter takes place in a private residence rather than a public place. Friedrich (1980) finds that officers are more likely to use force when the officer is responding to a complainant's request for service than when he is intervening on his/her own. In an examination of arrest decisions, Smith and Visher (1981) report that suspects are equally likely to be arrested if the encounter is officer initiated or a response to a complaint's request for police assistance. Finally, a more recent examination of police encounters with juvenile suspects yields several relevant findings: that officers are less likely to use their authority when they initiate the encounter themselves; officers are more likely to arrest a juvenile when the juvenile has some kind of weapon in their possession; and police are more likely to use authority (arrest, commands and threats, investigating) when they have some prior knowledge of the juvenile (when the police have some other information other than what is apparent from the immediate situation) (Worden

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

and Myers, 1999).

In situations where an officer intervenes at a citizen's request, where the encounter does not take place in a private residence, or when the juvenile has a weapon in their possession, officers might be more likely to take authoritative actions. Arguably, when an officer has prior knowledge of a juvenile it is most likely for something the juvenile has done wrong in the past. In these instances, one would expect officers would be more likely to use their authority and less likely to offer support and assistance.

Finally, previous research suggests that officers are increasingly likely to arrest or use force as the number of bystanders increases (Smith and Visher, 1981; Freidrich, 1980), and police are increasingly likely to use force as the number of police at the scene increases (Friedrich, 1980). Officers may feel a greater need to gain control of the situation when more people are around so that a small problem does not escalate into a larger one, perhaps into a riotous situation. As the number of police personnel and citizens at the scene increase, one might expect that police would be more likely to rely on their coercive authority to take control; they might also be less likely to use any supportive and assistance actions. The same may be true if a police supervisor was at the scene: officers may feel the need to apply the amount of authority called for and to go by the book while their supervisor is around.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Summary of Expectations for Extralegal Factors:

Use of Authority

Suspect Race – It is expected that police will be more likely to take authoritative actions when the suspect is a minority than when the suspect is white.

Suspect Sex - It is expected that officers will be more likely to use authority toward male suspects than females, and that they will utilize more authority toward males.

Suspect Level of Wealth - It is expected that the police will be more likely to make an arrest and will utilize more authority when the juvenile appears to be of a lower level of SES.

Suspect Demeanor - It is expected that the police will be more likely to make an arrest and will utilize more authority toward juvenile suspects who are disrespectful toward the police.

Complainant Race - It is expected that when the complainant is a minority the police will be less likely to make an arrest and will utilize less authority than if the complainant were white.

Neighborhood SES - It is expected that juveniles who interact with police in neighborhoods that have higher social distress scores will be more likely to be arrested and will have more authority invoked on them than those juveniles interacting with police in lower socially distressed areas.

Officer Initiated - It is expected that officers will take less authoritative actions when they interact with a juvenile suspect on their own initiative than when they interact at a citizen's request.

Private Location - When an officer encounters a juvenile in a private home/residence he may be less likely to take authoritative actions than while encountering a juvenile in a public place.

Number of Officers - As the number of officers present increases, so will the amount of authority used.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Number of Citizens - As the number of bystanders increases, so will the amount of authority used by the officer.

Weapon - Officers will be more likely to take authoritative actions against juveniles who have a weapon in their possession.

Prior Knowledge - Officers who have some prior knowledge of the juveniles in the encounter will be more likely to take authoritative actions.

Supervisor - When there is a supervisor present at the scene, it is expected that officers will utilize more authority and will take more authoritative actions than when there is no supervisor present.

Provision of Support/Assistance

Suspect Race – It is expected that police will be less likely to offer comfort and assistance and will offer less of it when the suspect is a minority.

Suspect Sex - It is expected that officers will be more likely to offer assistance to female suspects than males, and that they will offer more of it.

Suspect Level of Wealth - Police officers might be expected to offer less comfort and assistance to juveniles who appear to be of low SES. One might also expect that officers might be more likely to offer assistance and support to juveniles who appear to be of lower socioeconomic status, because they may appear to be more in need of assistance than those juveniles with higher levels of wealth.

Suspect Demeanor - It is expected that the police will be less likely to offer support and assistance to juvenile suspects who are disrespectful than those who are respectful or deferential.

Neighborhood SES - It might be expected that juveniles who interact with police in neighborhoods that have higher social distress scores will be less likely to receive assistance and support than those interacting with police in lower socially distressed areas.

Number of Officers - As the number of officers present increases, officers will be less likely to provide support.

Number of Citizens - As the number of bystanders increases officers will be less likely to provide support.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Prior Knowledge - Officers who have some prior knowledge of the juveniles they encounter will be less likely to provide support and assistance to juveniles in trouble.

Supervisor - When there is a supervisor present at the scene, it is expected that officers will be less likely to provide support and assistance than when there is no supervisor present.

In conclusion, while these two theoretical orientations have been used in the past to explain police decision-making, they have rarely been synthesized as a social - psychological approach (but see Worden, 1989 for an example). In addition, this approach has not been used to explain police behavior with juvenile suspects. It is my expectation that this approach will deepen our understanding of police-juvenile interactions, especially with respect to how police outcomes with juveniles are shaped by the characteristics of the situation and the officers themselves. This next chapter will lay out the analytical framework for the analysis of police authority and support.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Data

The data that will be used for this research were collected as part of the Project on Policing Neighborhoods (POPN). The POPN study, funded by the National Institute of Justice, is a multi-method study of police which sought to better understand police-citizen interactions. Data were collected in two police departments: the Indianapolis, Indiana Police Department (IPD) and the St. Petersburg, Florida Police Department (SPPD) during the summers of 1996 and 1997, respectively. The IPD served a population of approximately 380,000 that is 77% White. The SPPD served a population of approximately 240,000 that is 76% White. These two departments might be considered generalizable to most urban, metropolitan, police departments - but they may be poor comparisons to rural and suburban policing. In addition, because observations in both sites took place during the summer months, we can only carefully generalize these data to policing generally. These data do not account for seasonal changes and what that may or may not bring to police work. This analysis utilizes data collected through systematic social observation of police patrol officers, as well as data collected through in-person interviews of patrol and community policing officers.

Observation of Patrol Officers

The principal method of data collection was systematic social observation of patrol

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

officers in the field. Trained observers rode with patrol and community officers during their assigned shifts. Observers were trained to make note of certain elements of police-citizen encounters and any other activities in which the observed officer took part[25]. The day after accompanying an officer for a work shift, observers wrote narrative accounts of the officer's work day and also coded information about encounters, citizens with whom the officer interacted, and other activities the officer performed[26].

The structure of the coded data is hierarchical. Observers completed a set of data items known as the ride form for the officer they accompanied on a shift; an encounter form for each encounter (within the observed ride) the officer was involved in; and a citizen form for each citizen, within the encounter, with whom the officer interacted[27]. Thus there are three levels of coded data, ride level, encounter level, and citizen level.

The ride narratives were completed to supplement coded data. Narratives account for all of an officer's day as it unfolds, with detailed explanations of who the officer interacted

[25]Prior to the start of the project, all police personnel were educated on the project and what the observations would entail. In order to protect officers and to minimize reactivity, officers were guaranteed confidentiality before the beginning of the project and before each ride. Observers could only discuss what they had seen with project staff and the officer's name was not recorded in any narrative or coded data.

[26]*Encounters* were defined as any event in which there is face to face communication between a police officer and a member of the public. There were three types of encounters: full encounters (the communication between the officer and citizen involves at least 3 verbal exchanges, lasts longer than a minute, or the communication involves some use of force); brief encounters (the officer communicates with some member of the public but there are not three exchanges, the encounter is less than a minute, and there is no physical force); and casual encounters (the observed officer communicates with some member of the public about a matter NOT related to police business - this encounter may be of any length) *Activities* were defined as anything the observed officer does that is not an encounter. This could include interactions with other police officers but not citizens, general patrol, traffic surveillance, etc (Project on Policing Neighborhoods, observer notebook).

[27]The ride, encounter, and citizen forms are attached as appendix C, D, and E respectively.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

with, what the interactions were about, how the police and citizen(s) communicated to each other, and the environment in which the interactions took place. Observers were trained to write the narrative accounts in a way that would allow one to recreate the specific details of officers' workday.

Observations were based on spatial and temporal sampling. Observers were directed to accompany officers who were working in specific beats, on selected shifts. In both IPD and SPPD twelve beats were selected for observation based on their level of social distress.[28] Selected beats varied in their levels of social distress ranging from below average to above average on levels of socioeconomic distress, so one could reasonably expect that beats varied in their service conditions. Beats with higher levels of social distress were over sampled. The samples of shifts represent all times of the day and all days of the week, though busier shifts were over sampled. A minimum of 28 shifts were observed in each of the study beats. Over 5,700 hours of observation were completed across these sites. These data include written narratives and coded, systematic, data on 680 juveniles (ages 6 to 17) who were at some point during their encounter with the observed officer treated as a suspect or a disputant.[29]

Patrol Officer Surveys

POPN sought to interview each patrol officer. The officer surveys were administered

---

[28]The level of social distress was based on an index which accounted for the percentage of a beat's population that was below the poverty line, the percent female headed household, and the percent unemployed.

[29]Observers were told to characterize a citizen's role (as suspect, disputant, etc.) by how the observed officer perceived that citizen. If the officer treated a person as a suspect, they were for POPN's purposes labeled a suspect. Suspects were defined as wrong-doers, peace disturbers, or the person complained about. Citizens were typed as disputants if their role was not clear, they

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

to officers by a trained interviewer in a private room, during their assigned shifts. Each individual officer was promised confidentiality. Of the 426 patrol officers assigned to one of IPD's four patrol districts during the study period, a total of 398 police officers were surveyed, producing a completion rate of 93%.[30] In St. Petersburg, 240 out of a possible 246 patrol officers were interviewed, a completion rate of 98%. The officer surveys captured information on officers' personal characteristics, backgrounds, and attitudes towards the police role. The officer survey data can be linked with the observation data by an officer identification number that was assigned to officers for this project and recorded on both the officer survey and the ride form in the observation data.

---

might appear to the officer to be both a suspect and a victim.

[30] Out of the 28 missing officer surveys, 10 were missing because interviewers were simply unable to track down the officers (three were reserve officers who did not work very often). A total of 18 police officers refused to take the survey all together, 15 of which came from one of the four districts.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Analytical Plan

This research will focus on police interactions with juveniles, ages 6 to 17, who were treated by the police as either a suspect or disputant (n= 654).[31] Hypotheses about how police use of authority and provision of support relate to officers' backgrounds and attitudes and the situations with which police are presented will be tested at the citizen level of analysis. Both narrative and coded data, collected through social observation, will be utilized to measure police use of authority and provision of support. Appendix A provides an illustration of the types of police actions that will be used to measure the authoritative and supportive constructs. Coded data on the encounters and the juveniles provide information on the situational context of these interactions. These factors will be utilized as explanatory variables. Finally, officer interview data will provide information on officers' personal attributes (e.g., race, sex, training in community policing) and their attitudes about the police role and the citizens they serve; these too will be used as explanatory factors in the analysis (see officer survey, Appendix B).

The coding of the dependent variable will determine which estimator will be used for a particular set of analyses. The least squares estimator has the most desirable characteristics in that it produces slope and intercept estimates that are unbiased[32] and efficient[33], and it also

[31]Because of missing officer interviews, the n size for multi-variate analysis drops to 564.

[32]That is, the formula produces the correct results on average.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

produces a statistic (R-square) which tells one how much error is reduced by using that particular equation to predict rather than using the mean of the dependent variable. Arguably, the R square statistic is one of the better features of least squares because it allows some substantive, interpretive, meaning. For these reasons (ease of interpretation and unbiased and efficient estimates) it is used by social scientists whenever the assumptions of least squares are met (or at least when they are not severely violated)[34].

One assumption of the linear regression model that is often violated is that the dependent variable is continuous in nature and can be well represented with a line. However, it is not always possible to measure social phenomena in this way. It is more often the case that dependent variables are dichotomous, ordinal, or categorical in nature. *Dichotomous* variables are easy to identify, they differ from continuous variables in that they represent an event as having occurred or not occurred (e.g., arrest or no arrest; bail or no bail) (Long, 1997). *Ordinal* measures lack a unit of measurement but one could order outcomes in a meaningful way - that is, one can determine which item is less or more of something than another (e.g., agreement: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree), but these measures are problematic because the precise distance between categories is unknown

---

[33]The term efficiency is reserved for estimates that are unbiased (see footnote 32) and which have the smallest possible variance for its sampling distribution.

[34]The assumptions for the classical regression model (OLS) are: 1. That the relationship between the independent and dependent variables can be described by a line; 2. That there are no exact linear relationships between two or more independent variables (no perfect collinearity); 3. That the independent variables are not correlated with the error term; 4. That the error term has a mean equal to zero and constant variance, the errors are drawn from a normal distribution, and the errors are uncorrelated with (e.g., independent of) each other; 5. That the dependent variable is continuous (Long, 1997: p.11-12; Aldrich and Nelson, 1984: p. 12)

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

(Hildebrand, Laing, and Rosenthal, 1977).[35] And finally, measures are termed *categorical* (also called nominal) when they contain multiple responses which, unlike ordinal measures, cannot be ordered in terms of more or less (Long, 1997). Ordinal and categorical measures are not always easily distinguishable from one anther and one should be concerned both with mistaking a measure as ordinal in nature when in fact it is categorical and with mistaking a measure as categorical when it is in fact ordinal.[36]

For this research I will measure two dimensions of police behavior: police use of authority and provision of support. The measurement and statistical analysis of these dimensions will depend on many of the assumptions discussed above.

Use of Authority

Police use of authority can be thought of and operationalized in many ways, one of which is a dichotomy: the decision to arrest or not arrest. Arguably this is the most coercive type of authority police officers can use as it has serious implications for the person being arrested, and many see the decision to arrest as the most important decision. This is reflected in the numerous studies of police arrests. A model will be estimated to determine the

[35]Usually, ordinal measures are treated as if they were interval, "the implicit assumption being that the intervals between adjacent categories are equal", and a linear regression model is used (Long, 1997: 115). Debates are on going as to whether or not this is appropriate. Either way the ordered logit model or probit model are appropriate for analyses with ordinal dependent variables. The assumptions are weaker than the assumptions of the linear regression model but the results are not as easily interpreted.

[36]Arguably, when one is unsure if a measure is ordered or nominal one should assume it is nominal. Statistical models for nominal level data require weaker assumptions than the model for ordinal data. This comes at a price, however, as one must have a large enough sample size to support the number of estimates for a multinomial analysis (a complete set of estimates for each response category, except the comparison category), with complex models (e.g., many explanatory factors) this may be problematic.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

relationship between officer and situational characteristics and police decisions to arrest in these juvenile cases. The measure of arrest will be a dichotomy, coded as one (1) when the police arrest a juvenile suspect, and as a zero (0) otherwise. Because this dependent variable is dichotomous it violates important assumptions of the linear regression model[37]; thus a logit model will be used to estimate the effects of the explanatory factors.

As I have stated previously in this paper, arrest is only one form of police authority - albeit an important form - and there are many other police actions that might be included in a measure of police authority. Appendix A fully describes the police actions that I will use to measure this dimension as well as the data source being used to capture each type of authority. Below I identify the types of actions, they are listed in order from least to most coercive (some of them are considered equal in their coerciveness), and I assign numbers (1 to 5)[38] to reflect their level of authoritativeness or coerciveness, this breaks up the independent police actions as finely as is possible (as finely as the data allow). Theoretically, one could think of the numbers one through five as incremental steps or levels of authority.

[37]OLS assumes that the dependent variable is continuous (or interval) in nature. It also assumes that the error term has constant variance and a mean equal to zero; when the dependent variable is dichotomous the error term is heteroschedastic (the variance is not the same for each independent variable). This problem with the error term makes the standard errors biased and as a result the significance tests are unreliable (t score = slope coefficient/standard error of slope coefficient). In addition to this, if one uses OLS on a binary variable, it is possible to produce probabilities greater than one and less than zero - which of course does not make logical sense. - The down side of using the logit model instead is that this estimator does not produce an R- square statistic and it produces estimates that are not as easily interpretable (log odds) as the OLS slope estimates - they can, however, be transformed into simple odds.

[38]The numbers 1 through 5 are used only to reflect the levels of authoritativeness in terms of how these actions relate to each other - and how they might be ranked from low to high (1 being low, 5 being high).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Before I discuss this further, look at the independent police actions (and their level of coerciveness) that can be captured (using these data) for this dimension of police behavior:

A. Inquiring into the nature of the problem (1)
B. Listening to one or more sides of the problem (1)
C. Suggesting, requesting or persuading the juvenile to:
    leave the area (1);
    cease disorderly behavior (1);
    discontinue illegal behavior (1);
    sign a formal complaint (1)
D. Lecturing (1)
E. Stopping someone from telling their side of the story (1)
F. Taking a report (2)
G. Declining or refusing to take a report after a citizen requests that one be filed (2)

H. Investigating
    interrogating the juvenile (2);
    searching the juveniles or the area around the juvenile (2);
I. Handcuffing w/out arresting (2)
J. Commanding or threatening the juvenile to:
    leave the area (3);
    cease disorderly behavior (3);
    discontinue illegal behavior (3);
    sign a formal complaint (3);
K. Threatening to issue a citation (3)
L. Threatening to arrest (3)
M. Issuing a citation (4)
N. Telling a parent or guardian (4)

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

O. Arresting the juvenile (5)

The numerical assignments are based on the level of authority these actions represent relative to each other. So, for example, arrest is five levels higher than outright release, four steps or levels higher than a request to cease disorderly behavior, it is two levels higher than a threat to arrest, and one level higher than issuing a citation or telling a parent or guardian. These are not easy distinctions to make and one could struggle for some time (as I have) with deciding the coercive distance between individual actions. For some of these behaviors (sections C and J) the amount of coercive authority they represent can be judged in two ways; first by how the police communicate their expectations or demands (by suggesting, requesting, persuading, commanding, or threatening) and second by what it is that the police want to happen (what do they want the juvenile to do: for example, cease disorderly behavior vs. sign a complaint). While suggesting or requesting that a juvenile take some action is less coercive than threatening or commanding that same action, are requests to discontinue illegal behavior equivalent to requests to leave the area? For analytical purposes I will treat these two actions as equivalent based on how they are *communicated* to a juvenile. One could make an argument that the latter is less coercive than the former due to *what action* the police officer desires. I do not deny that theoretically there may be a slight difference in their authoritative value, but I think the difference is less important than the simplicity achieved by treating them as equivalent.[39]

[39] One could view arrest and issuing a citation similarly. Is arrest more authority when it is for a felony than when it is for a misdemeanor? Indeed, police do have discretion to decide what a person is charged with. Does the authoritative value of a citation vary depending on what the citation is for? Maybe. Again, I would not disagree with the argument that there may be a

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

In analysis one could, for each juvenile citizen, measure the 'quantity' or 'amount' of authority used by the police by simply summing up the occurrence of these independent actions. Multi-variate analysis could then be done using the least squares estimator and estimates could then be interpreted as being related to the use of 'more' or 'less' police authority. These estimates are limited though because they do not have much substantive meaning (there is no specific unit of measurement). Questions of 'how much more' and 'how much less' cannot be answered.[40] Still, to capture the 'quantity' of authority, and the relationship between the quantity of police authority utilized and the independent variables, this is an adequate measure to use.

An alternative is to measure police authority as an ordinal or nominal level variable. To create this measure one could essentially capture the most 'authoritative' behavior used against a juvenile. Arguably, this measure provides a different view of police authority. It does not speak to the 'quantity' of authority, it instead speaks to 'authority' in terms of the highest level used by the observed officer. As a result, if an officer were to question a juvenile about their wrongdoing, request that they leave the area and then issue a citation, the only action captured by this measure would be the issuance of a citation. This might be considered as a limitation to constructing a measure of police use of authority in this way. However, it might be that, realistically, the most authoritative disposition imposed in the one

---

difference in authoritative value, but I do not think the difference is significant enough to warrant breaking up these actions more finely.

[40]Usually the analysis of continuous variables yields estimates that have more substantive meaning. For example, an analysis of personal income level might yield results like 'for every additional year of college education one can expect to increase their income by 2,000 dollars'. Analyses of abstract constructs like 'police use of authority and provision of support' are not as easily

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

that really matters. That is to say, it is the highest level that matters because one might suppose that police utilize the level of authority that is *necessary* to handle the situation.

To create the ordinal or nominal measure, the actions could be collapsed into ordered categories by using the numerical assignments. For example, all of the actions assigned a one (1) would be captured in the first category, all actions assigned a two (2) would be in the second category, etc. Essentially there would be six categories, including the reference (or no authority) category. Assuming these categories are ordered in a meaningful way and they can be ranked in terms of more or less (but without a unit of measurement), one could treated the variable as ordinal. One must give serious consideration to one assumption of measurement: whether or not the categories can be ranked in terms of more or less. This is an assumption that can be difficult to satisfy when measuring abstract constructs and for this reason many opt for the multi-nominal analysis which treats the categories as 'categories' and only compares each category to a reference category. In my opinion, the multinomial analysis is the safer route to go as it requires weaker assumptions (namely, it treats the categories as categories that do not have to be ordered in any meaningful way).

But there are some limitations to treating the measure as categorical (or nominal). First, it speaks to the dimension of police behavior being studied - it suggests that the researcher does not have much faith that the actions used to measure this dimension (authority) can be ordered in a meaningful way. This is in contrast to statements I made earlier in the dissertation (that researchers should try and measure this dimension on a

---

interpretable because they lack a specific unit of measure (such as dollars).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

continuum of 'less to more' authority) and it conflicts with the premise that making these fine distinctions is necessary inasmuch as one thinks these distinctions are important in practice.

Second, as I stated above, a multi-nominal analysis really paints a different picture - it yields results much different than the results from an ordinal analysis and from the least squares estimator. Namely, one cannot speak in terms of more or less authority because this measure does not capture 'quantity' in a true sense, rather one can interpret results in terms of whether or not police are likely to do one set of actions rather than 'no action' depending on the explanatory factors. This limitation could also be viewed as a positive when compared to a least squares or ordinal analysis. These analyses (ordered logit or least squares) would reveal vague results where it is unknown 'how much more or less authority' is likely given certain conditions. And finally, one last limitation to the multi-nominal analysis (I mentioned this briefly before) is that the sample must be able to support such a large amount of estimates. Estimates are created for each category of the dependent variable (except the reference (no action) category).

There might also be benefits to treating the dependent variable as nominal. If, for example, officers who are attitudinally aggressive are more likely to command or threaten but they are not more likely to arrest juveniles than less aggressive officers, this distinction might be blurred or missed in either an ordinal or least squares analysis. By separating out the categories and comparing them each independently to 'inaction' one can get a better idea of whether or not the explanatory factors affect some police decisions, but not others (some authoritative actions, but not all). Treating this measure as ordinal imposes 'order' when

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

officers may not really think in these terms. In my opinion because the continuous, ordinal, and nominal analysis offer different positives and negatives, and because the interpretations are really quite different, each set of analyses should be done to test the sensitivity of the measures.

Provision of Support

Similar to the authority construct, one could measure and analyze the provision of support in a couple of ways (the interpretive meaning varies by the way the construct is measured and analyzed). The same assumptions of measurement apply, there is no need to review them again. Once again I use numbers to indicate the level of support or assistance that these police actions reflect, relative to each other. This measure will be less complex than the measure of police authority because there are fewer 'supportive' behaviors captured in these data. Here are the police actions that will be used to measure this construct (these are illustrated in Appendix A - which also identifies the data source):

A. *Partially* complying with:
    a request for information on how to deal with a problem (1)
    a request for physical assistance (1)
B. *Fully* complying with:
    a request for information on how to deal with a problem (2)
    a request for physical assistance (2)
C. Providing information on their own initiative (2)
D. Providing physical assistance on their own initiative (2)
E. Being sympathetic to the situation (2)
F. Offering comfort or reassurance (2)

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The numerical assignments are based on the level of support and assistance these actions represent relative to each other. There are two levels of support reflected here. The first level includes those police actions that are supportive in nature and which occurred after a juvenile asked police for either physical assistance or for information on how to deal with a problem. If the officer partially complied in the juvenile's presence then the behavior is captured here. If the officer *fully* complied with the juvenile's request the behavior is captured at the second level. The second level of the support measure also includes those actions that the police offered on their *own initiative*: providing information; providing physical assistance; being sympathetic; or offering comfort or reassurance.

I will measure this construct in three ways. First as a dichotomy: did the observed officer provide any support at all (1), or none (0). Second, as a continuum, by adding up the occurrences of the independent police actions (using the assigned numbers), much like one of the measures created for the authority construct. Analysis of the first measure would provide information on how the explanatory factors affect the use of *any* support. Analysis of the second measure would reveal the extent to which the amount or 'quantity' of police support is shaped by police officer and situational characteristics. Results could then be interpreted in terms of more or less support. Like the measure constructed for police use of authority, interpretations are limited because there is not a specific unit of measure. It will be unclear 'how much more' or 'how much less' support officers provide under certain conditions. However, this is still an appropriate measure which can be used to test the propositions put forth in this paper, there is no 'perfect' measure. A nominal measure will also be constructed to test for sensitivity in the measures. Much like the nominal measure

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

created for authority, the actions will be assigned to categories based on their numeric assignment; creating three categories. Multinomial logistic regression will be used to estimate these equations. These results can be interpreted by comparing each of the two levels (categories) of support to the 'no support' category.

It should be clear from this discussion and from Appendix A that qualitative and quantitative data analysis will be done to construct the dependent variables. Observer narrative descriptions will be examined as a reliability check on the coded data and to capture additional elements of the two behavioral constructs. Descriptive statistics and bivariate analysis will be presented in order to study the frequencies of specific police actions and the bi-variate relationship between independent and dependent variables. Equations will be constructed and multivariate analyses will be completed to estimate the main effects of the explanatory factors.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

CHAPTER FIVE

MEASURES AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Observers for POPN recorded information on 443 police-juvenile encounters where at least one juvenile was treated by the observed officer as a suspect. This chapter will outline the measures and frequency distributions for both the characteristics and attitudes of the police officers who encountered juvenile suspects and the characteristics of those juvenile suspects involved in the encounters. In addition, descriptive statistics for the dependent variables will be presented and discussed.

Independent Variables

Officer Characteristics

As noted earlier, the data on police officers' personal and background characteristics were captured on the patrol officer surveys. These surveys can be linked to the observation data using an officer identification number which was assigned to all officers for this project, and which was noted in the observation data and on the officer surveys. Table 5-1 presents the distributions of officers' characteristics. Officer sex and race are dummy variables. Officer education is a categorical variable which distinguishes between those officers with

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

no college education and those either with some college education or a bachelors degree or higher. When juveniles in these two sites encounter the police, they are most likely to interact with a male, white, officer who has some formal college education. In thirty-nine percent of these encounters the observed officer had some college experience but not a bachelor's degree, and in forty-five percent of encounters officers had a bachelors degree or higher. The expectation is that female, minority, and more educated officers will be less likely to use authority (in frequency and intensity) and more likely to offer support or assistance than those officers who are male, white, or less educated.

Officer length of service is a continuous variable which ranges from less than one year of service to 31 years. In 16% of encounters, officers had less than one year on the job, in 35% officers had between two and six years, in 29% police had between 7 and 10 years, and in the remaining 20% officers had ten plus years of experience on the job. It is expected that officers with more years of service will use less authority and provide more support than those officers with fewer years of experience. There was also substantial variation in officer age (not in the table) which ranged from 22 to 61 years; the Pearson r correlation for officer length of service and age is .84 (significant with a two tail test). Officer assignment, as a "community policing specialist" or "run or 911" officer, is a dummy variable where run officer is the reference category. In almost 90 percent of police-juvenile encounters the officer was a run or 911 officer who was regularly dispatched calls for service.

With respect to training in community policing, most officers in these encounters, regardless of assignment, were exposed to some training. The community policing training measure is an ordinal variable which distinguishes between officers with less than one full

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

day, officers with one to two days, and officers with at least three days of training on this topic. In three quarters of encounters, officers had received at least one day of training in community policing. Some officers also reported that they had received some training in mediation skills. Because so few officers had received more than one day of training in mediation skills, this measure is a dummy variable, distinguishing between those officers who had received less than one day of training and officers who had received one day or more. As table 5-1 illustrates, officers were more likely to have acquired training in community policing concepts than they were in mediation skills. While only 29 percent of officers had received at least one day of training in mediation skills, almost 80 percent of officers had received that much training in community policing. In forty percent of encounters, officers had received three or more days of training in community policing concepts and principles. The expectation is that officers with more or any training in either of these two areas will utilize less authority and provide more support and assistance in their encounters with juveniles than those officers with less or no such training.

Officer Attitudes

A total of six measures are constructed to examine officer attitudes about citizens, aggressiveness, selectivity, and role orientation. The dependent variables will be regressed on these attitudinal measures. This section will briefly describe how these attitudinal constructs are measured, and will also discuss the frequency and percentage distributions for the measures.

Cynicism - The measure of officer cynicism captures officers' views of the proportion

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

of citizens who would be willing to cooperate with, and help, police. A single composite measure is formed by adding three survey items (all items are coded as 1 = most, 2 = some, 3 = few, 4 = none): (1) How many citizens in your beat would call the police if they saw something suspicious?; (2) How many of the citizens in your beat would provide information about a crime if they knew something and were asked about it by police?; (3) How many of the citizens in your beat are willing to work with police to try to solve neighborhood problems? Tables 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4 show the distributions for these individual survey items and table 5-5 displays the distribution for the additive index. The distributions for the individual items indicate that officers vary in their perceptions of citizen willingness to cooperate and help them, but few are so cynical about citizens that they answered 'none' to any of these questions. The modal response for each question was that *most* citizens would call the police if they saw something suspicious, *some* would provide information about a crime, and *some* citizens would work with the police on neighborhood problems. Still, sometimes officers in these encounters generally held the belief that few citizens would cooperate (see tables 5-2 through 5-4).

These individual items were significantly correlated with one another at an average of .49, and they formed a composite measure with a reliability alpha score of .74.[41] The items were also factor analyzed and produced a single factor with an eigenvalue of 1.99. The scores on the additive index ranged from a low of 3 (least cynical) to a high of 11 (most cynical). The expectation is that officers with more cynical views of citizen cooperation will

[41]These are Pearson r correlations (the .49 average) and the items were all significantly correlated at the .01 level (two tailed test).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

use more authority and provide less support than officers with less cynical perspectives of citizens.

Assistance - Attitudinal proclivities toward assisting citizens is measured using a single survey item which asks officers to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement (coded as 1=disagree strongly, 2= disagree somewhat, 3=agree somewhat, 4 =agree strongly): Assisting citizens is as important as enforcing the law. The frequency distribution for this measure is illustrated in Table 5-8. In the majority of encounters, officers were in agreement with this statement, though at different levels. In approximately 78% of encounters police officers strongly agreed with this statement, in another 20% officers 'somewhat agreed' that assisting citizens was as important as enforcing the law. Few officers indicated that they disagreed with this statement. Unfortunately, this variable is highly skewed and as a result might not be of much use in the multivariate analysis. Either this measure is not sensitive enough to capture variation in officer attitudes regarding assisting citizens, or there simply is not much variation. The expectation is that officers who agree more about the importance of assisting citizens will use less authority (in frequency and intensity) and provide more support than officers who agree less or disagree with this statement.

Aggressiveness - Officers' attitudes toward aggressive enforcement are measured with a single survey item which captures agreement with the following statement (coded as disagree strongly = 1, disagree somewhat = 2, agree somewhat = 3, agree strongly = 4): A good patrol officer is one who patrols aggressively by stopping cars, checking out people, running license checks, and so forth. The frequency distribution for this item is shown in

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-6 where a higher score indicates a more thta officers agree more with an aggressive operational style. In 28% of encounters, officers strongly agreed with this statement, and in another 49%, officers indicated that they somewhat agreed (this was the modal response category). Just over twenty percent indicated some kind of 'disagreement' with this statement. Attitudinally, officers in these encounters clearly favored an aggressive style of policing.

Selectivity - Officers' attitudes toward selective enforcement is also measured with a single survey item. Officers were asked: How frequently would you say there are good reasons for not arresting someone who has committed a minor criminal offense? (coded as never =1, rarely = 2, sometimes = 3, often = 4). Table 5-7 shows the frequency distribution for this item, the modal response was that 'sometimes' there were good reasons for not making an arrest (64%). In less than 20% of encounters officers indicated that they rarely or never thought there were good reasons for not making the arrest. Considering this evidence, one might say that officers do seem to attitudinally favor selective enforcement of the law.

Role Orientation - Patrol officers' role orientation is measured in two ways. The first is a measure of officers' orientation toward law enforcement, and is measured by a single survey item, which asked officers to agree or disagree with the statement: Enforcing the law is by far a patrol officer's most important responsibility. Table 5-9 displays the response categories and the numeric and percentage distributions for encounters. In most encounters (83%), officers agreed either 'somewhat' or 'strongly' with this statement. The modal response category was that officers 'agreed somewhat' that enforcing the law was by far their most important responsibility. Fewer than twenty percent indicated that they disagreed at all

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

with this statement. Most officers seem to be strongly identifying with the law enforcement part of their role.

The second measure also captures officers' role orientation by tapping into how broadly they define their role. A single composite measure is created by summing the responses of six survey items that ask officers to reveal how often they should be expected to handle the following problems (all coded as 1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = much of the time, 4 = always): public nuisances; neighbor disputes; family disputes; litter and trash; parents who don't control their kids; and nuisance businesses. Officers with a more expansive view of their role (i.e., those who readily accept order maintenance and community policing activities as part of their job) would be expected to include handling these problems in their job description. Tables 5-10 through 5-15 display the numeric and percentage distributions for each individual survey item. The most frequent response to individual questions were that officers thought they should 'sometimes' be expected to deal with public nuisances and parents who don't control their kids, 'sometimes' manage problems with litter and trash, 'always' take care of neighbor and family disputes, and that they should have to take care of nuisance businesses 'much of the time'.

The role orientation items modestly (and significantly) correlate, with an average Pearson r coefficient of .28. When the items are factor analyzed, using the principal components method, one could argue that two factors emerge. However, the second factor is quite weak and explained only 17 percent of the variation in the correlation matrix for these items (eigenvalue of 1.0). The first factor explained 40 percent of the variation (with an eigenvalue of 2.4), and all of the items loaded similarly with an average loading of .633

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

(all loadings fell between .537 and .759). These six items have a reliability alpha score of .70. One could, based on the factor analysis, argue that there might be two underlying concepts here, but given what is being measured (and the absence of clear cut rules for deciding the number of factors/concepts) it could be argued that these items should remain together. If in factor analyzing these items one drops the 'parents who don't control their kids' item, which loads lowest at .537 on the first factor and highest on the second factor at .576, only one factor emerges from the principle component analysis. As such, one could easily drop this item from the scale construction. However, keeping it in helps to capture a more in-depth assessment of whether or not officers accept initiatives such as these - initiatives that might be associated with community policing - as part of their role. For this substantive reason the six items will be kept together as one concept. The additive index formed by summing these items ranges from a low of 9 to a high of 24 (see Table 5-16); the higher the score, the broader the officer's role orientation.

Juvenile Encounters: Characteristics of the Situation

Table 5-17 shows the descriptive statistics for the characteristics of police - juvenile encounters. The literature review and hypothesis section in Chapter 3 portrayed situational factors as legal and extralegal, and as such, Table 5-17 categorizes the measures in that way. The legal factors include the seriousness of the problem and victim arrest preference. These data suggest that police encounters with juveniles are more likely than not of a non-serious nature. There are two indicators of problem seriousness displayed in Table 5-17; nature of the problem and a seriousness scale. Nature of the problem is a categorical variable which

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

classifies the most important problem at the end of the encounter into one of twelve categories.[42] The modal problem category is public disorder, which includes problems of public nuisance, disorder, noise disturbances, curfew violations, and problems dealing with litter and trash, etc. The next most frequent problem category is non-violent crime (e.g., harassment, missing or stolen property, theft from residence or motor vehicle, shoplifting, etc.), followed by traffic offenses and then violent crimes (e.g., physical injuries, threatened physical injury, fights and assaults, domestic fights, robbery, etc.). The second indicator, seriousness, is an ordinal variable which classifies problems based on their legal seriousness and the potential harm to the victim (see Worden and Myers, 1999). Five categories of seriousness are defined here based on factors that structure judgments about the relative seriousness of offenses (see Sellin and Wolfgang, 1964 and Klinger, 1994 for a more in depth discussion). Both measures suggest that most police-juvenile encounters are of a non-serious nature but there are times when the problem is a serious one.

Table 5-17 also illustrates that it was unlikely for a complainant or victim to be present during encounters, as a victim was present in only 20 percent of cases.[43] Few victims requested some specific police action. Victims requested arrest in only twelve encounters (or 2.7%), and they requested that no arrest be made in only two encounters. Requests were made for some other police action (to advise suspects, to warn suspects, to file a complaint, or to have suspects leave the area) during only 25 encounters (or under 6%). In most

[42]Observers had over 200 problems codes at their disposal when classifying problems, this grouping, shown in Table 5-17, aggregates those problem codes to twelve categories.

[43]There was a minority complainant present in only 12% of encounters. In multi-variate analysis this will be measured as a dichotomy where 1=minority and 0=non minority.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

encounters, only the police and juvenile(s) were present. The absence of complainants and their preferences suggests that police were more able to make decisions based on their own sense of what ought to be done.

Encounter characteristics that are considered ‘extralegal’ include: who initiated the encounter; the location of the encounter; whether or not the complainant was a minority; and whether or not a supervisor was present. While research conducted in the 1960's and 1970's suggest that two thirds to three fourths of police-juvenile encounters are initiated by a source other than the police (usually a complainant), these data indicate that contemporary police (at least at these two sites) initiate about half of their interactions with juvenile suspects (see Table 5-17). For multi-variate analysis, officer proactivity will be measured dichotomously, distinguishing between encounters that were officer initiated (1) and encounters that were initiated by a person other than the observed officer (0) (e.g., a complainant or other officer).

The upward shift in police initiating contacts with juveniles is somewhat expected given the current community policing philosophy being embraced by most police departments throughout the country - and certainly by the two departments studied for POPN. This finding does not, however, hold constant across the two research sites. Although the same number of rides were observed across the two sites, police averaged more encounters with juveniles in Indianapolis. Project observers recorded 283 encounters with juvenile suspects in Indianapolis compared to 160 encounters in St. Petersburg. While 53% of police-juvenile encounters were initiated by the observed police officers in Indianapolis, only 32% of the observed encounters were officer initiated in St. Petersburg.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This difference might be partly explained by two phenomena in Indianapolis. First, as stated earlier, IPD espoused a more aggressive, broken windows, style of community policing where police were specifically instructed to make more stops and to be more proactive. Second, Indianapolis had a curfew ordinance which made it a violation for juveniles to be on the streets past 11pm on weekdays and midnight on Fridays and Saturdays. This gave police in Indianapolis a reason to stop kids after-hours to check their age, and send them home, or to take whatever action they thought necessary.

A closer examination of officer proactivity shows that, while the difference in officer initiated encounters from the 1960's to current day might be partly explained by the type of community policing advocated at the IPD, it is further explained when one looks at officer proactivity, research site, and the time of day at which these encounters occurred[44]. This closer scrutiny suggests that the existence of a curfew ordinance had an effect, apart from the type of community policing espoused, on police officer proactivity. Specifically, between midnight and 7AM, observed officers in Indianapolis had 61 encounters with juveniles, 71% of which were initiated by the observed officer; in St. Petersburg there were 28 encounters with juveniles after midnight, only 21% of which were initiated by the observed officer.[45] At no other time of the day (7AM to Noon, Noon to 7PM) is the percentage difference between

[44]The Pearson r correlation for site and proactivity is significant at the .01 level (two tailed test), suggesting that in St Petersburg encounters with juveniles are less likely to be officer initiated than encounters in Indianapolis. The Pearson r correlation for proactivity and time of day is significant at the .05 level (one tailed test) suggesting, that after midnight officers are more proactive than they are during the day. Given the crosstabulation of site by proactivity by time of day, one would predict that the relationship between time of day and proactive behavior is mostly born from the IPD site.

[45]The same amount of night shifts were observed from department to department, so there were

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

sites as pronounced as it is from midnight to 7AM. The percentage of encounters that are officer initiated in Indianapolis does exceed the percent of officer initiated encounters in St. Petersburg at the other time periods, but the difference ranges from 8% to 16% - much lower than the 50% difference observed between midnight and 7AM. The impact of the curfew ordinance in Indianapolis appears to be that police were more likely to initiate contacts with juveniles during the over-night hours.

Additionally, these data show that officers interacted with one juvenile in 69% of encounters, with two juveniles in 20% of encounters and with three or more in 11% of encounters. As Table 5-17 indicates, the majority of these encounters (71%) occurred either out in public or on mass private property such as a shopping mall or parking lot. Only 28% took place on private property (inside or out) and less than one percent occurred at a police facility. In only 6% of encounters was there a supervisor on scene.

Finally, the measure of neighborhood social distress is continuous in nature. It is an additive index which includes three neighborhood factors: % female headed households; % unemployed; % of population below the 50% poverty level (this measure was created by Roger Parks, see Parks et.al., 1999). This variable has a range of 5 to 101, the higher the score, the more distressed the neighborhood.

Characteristics of the Suspects

Police were observed interacting with 654 juvenile suspects. This next section will describe the characteristics of the suspects which, like the encounter characteristics, fell into

---

equal opportunities at both research sites to observe encounters after midnight.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

one of two categories: legal or extralegal factors (see table 5-18). The legal factors include the amount of evidence available to police that linked the juvenile to some wrongdoing, evidence of alcohol or drug use, and weapon possession. Extra-legal factors include the suspects' race, sex, level of wealth, demeanor, and whether or not the police had some knowledge of the suspect prior to the encounter. Table 5-18 displays the frequency and percent distributions of the juvenile characteristics. The measure for evidence is a scale that is created by summing the points assigned to the following specific conditions: a citizen at the scene had second hand information implicating the juvenile in an offense (1 point); a citizen at the scene had observed the juvenile in an illegal act (first hand information) (1 point); the juvenile partially confessed to the police (1 point); the juvenile fit the description of someone wanted by the police (1 point); the officer observed physical evidence that implicated the juvenile in an offense (2 points); the juvenile gave a full confession (2 points); or the officer observed the juvenile in an illegal act or observed some kind of circumstantial evidence and the act (2 points) (see Mastrofski et. al., 1995). Police had at least some kind of evidence to implicate about half of juvenile suspects (49%). If the offense was a felony, when these forms of evidence are combined to form a scale, a value of two might be considered probable cause for arrest (see Worden and Myers, 1999); police most likely had enough evidence to support arresting or taking into custody about 40 % of juvenile suspects.[46]

[46]This might be a high threshold as most offenses are misdemeanors and officers could arrest only if they observed the offense themselves, a complainant were willing to sign a complain, or the suspect made a confession. This measure is not a precise measure of the legal term probable cause, it is merely a point of comparison where probable cause might have existed if the offenses were of a serious nature (which most were not).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The measure of alcohol and drug use captures whether or not there were any indications of use and if there were any observable behavioral effects. The variable is displayed in Table 5-18 as categorical, distinguishing between those juveniles who showed no indication of use and no behavioral effects, juveniles showing some indications but no physical or behavioral manifestations, and juveniles displaying behavioral effects. Only 25 juveniles (3.8%) showed some indication of alcohol or drug use, and an additional 17 juveniles (2.6%) displayed some behavioral effects as well. Because the use of alcohol or drugs is illegal for juveniles, for the multi-variate analysis, the measure for alcohol or drug use will be collapsed into a dummy variable which compares juveniles who either showed some indication of use or showed behavioral effects to juveniles who displayed neither. The measure for weapon possession will also be a dummy variable, which compares juveniles with some kind of weapon in their possession to juveniles with no weapon. Only 8 juvenile suspects were found to have a weapon in their possession.[47]

The measures of juveniles' personal characteristics (i.e., race, sex, level of wealth) are all dummy variables which distinguishes between minorities and whites, males and females, and juveniles from lower levels of wealth (low social class) and higher levels of wealth (e.g., middle class and above). When police encountered juvenile suspects they were most likely to interact with a minority male who appeared have a low level of wealth.[48]

---

[47]Two juveniles had a firearm, two had a knife, two had some sort of blunt instrument, and two had some other kind of weapon.

[48]Observers were asked to identify citizens as belonging to one of these four levels of wealth: chronic poverty; low; middle; and above middle. *Chronic* poverty included those who were homeless and had no apparent means of support. A person in the *low* category would be someone who has basic needs (food and shelter) but lives at very modest levels, only slightly above what's

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The measure of demeanor is also a dummy variable, distinguishing between juveniles who are disrespectful and those who are respectful. The expectation is that disrespectful youth will be subject to more authority and less support by police than respectful youth. Juveniles were coded as being disrespectful if they did something, or failed to do something, that showed disrespect to the officer or to the officer's authority.[49] Just over 12 % of juvenile suspects were disrespectful to police.

It was unlikely for police to have some prior knowledge of the juveniles. This measure is a dummy variable, where juveniles who are known by the police in any way are compared to juveniles who are not known to the police at all (see 'prior knowledge' in Table 5-18). Overall, officers had at least some prior knowledge of about 14% of suspects, usually knowing their name and something about them (e.g., where they lived, etc.). Officers only knew the juvenile's face or of their reputation in 4% of cases, and they infrequently knew the juvenile well enough to have their personal information, address, or information on their family and friends.

Police Behavior: Dependent Variables

---

necessary to survive. *Middle* includes people with jobs that are above minimum wage and those who provide more than modest home environment for their families (working class). *Above middle* includes people whose personal appearance and possessions suggest that they are able to afford luxury items - they might have professional jobs, large homes, and expensive jewelry (POPN Observer Notebook, 1997). This variable is collapsed into a dummy variable comparing middle class and above to lower class (only one juvenile was coded as being in chronic poverty).

[49]Observers had lengthy directions on how to code disrespect. Actions that could have been included were: calling the officer names, making derogatory statements, making disparaging or belittling remarks or slurs. Juveniles were also considered disrespectful if they failed to do something: for
example, ignoring officers commands or questions (POPN Observer Notebook, 1997).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Police Authority

When police interact with juvenile suspects it is likely that they will use their authority in some way, whether it be to merely inquire about a problem, to question the juvenile about their participation in some wrongdoing, or to use a more formalized police response such as arrest. The previous chapter identified how police authority is operationalized for this study by illustrating what police actions are captured to measure the authoritative dimension of police behavior. Table 5-19 displays the frequency distributions for police behaviors that comprise the measure of authority; the behaviors are listed in the same order as they were in Chapter 4, from least to most coercive. Typically, police behavior is operationalized by analyzing the arrest decision. Table 5-19 shows that of the 654 juvenile suspects encountered by the police, 84 or 12.8% were arrested. In addition, these data illustrate that juveniles might be subject to many forms of police authority over the course of an encounter. The kinds of police authority captured ranged from minimally coercive, mostly passive, behaviors (e.g., inquiring into the nature of the problem, making suggestions or requests) to more formalized and coercive police responses like interrogating, searching, issuing commands and threats, and making arrests. Only 38, or 5.8% of suspects were not subject to any of these forms of police authority[50].

When measuring authority in terms of it's relative 'quantity', police responses that are considered only slightly coercive (as shown in Table 5-19) include inquiring into the nature of the problem, listening to one or both sides of the story, making suggestions or

[50]It is possible that these suspects were recipients of some other form of authority from police that is not captured here - but the behaviors captured seem fairly exhaustive.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

requests, and lecturing. Collectively and individually, these police behaviors occurred quite frequently. When one considers all of the behaviors shown on Table 5-19, the modal police behavior is "listening to the juvenile's side of the story", a behavior that is only slightly coercive in nature. Officers listened to the juvenile's rendition of what the problem was (or was not) in about 60% of cases, police stopped 3% of suspects from telling their side of the story, and asked 45% of juveniles for some information on the problem. Police made a suggestion or request that the suspect leave the area, cease disorderly behavior, discontinue illegal behavior, or provide some information about a crime or suspected wrongdoer to 33% of juvenile suspects. Of these, the most frequent request was to cease disorderly behavior (see Table 5-19). Police lectured 22% of the juveniles they encountered. The frequency of these minimally coercive police responses is not surprising. One would expect that police begin to handle problems with juveniles (as well as adults) by using only slightly coercive tactics and that the coercive nature of the response will increase only when faced with resistance or as the situation unfolds as a more serious one.

Police often responded to suspects by taking some investigative or more authoritative police action. Police took a report on the situation with 15% of juveniles, they interrogated 48% of juveniles, and police searched either the juvenile, their belongings, or the immediate area in 20% of cases. Police also handcuffed about 4% of juvenile suspects when doing so was exclusive of an arrest. Police seemed to use the action of handcuffing as a way to ensure that the juvenile would not run away while more information was being gathered. In addition, if police were transporting the suspect from one location to another they also handcuff

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

him/her while they were in the police car. Considered together, approximately 60% of juveniles were subject to at least some form of investigation, most likely consisting of nothing more than being interrogated about their participation in some wrongdoing.

Police behavior considered more coercive than investigative tactics include the issuance of commands and threats to suspects. Less than one percent of juveniles were threatened or commanded by police to provide information about a crime or suspect. Police threatened or commanded 7% of suspects to leave the area, 8% to discontinue illegal behavior, and 15% to cease disorderly behavior. Police threatened 6% of suspects with a citation and threatened 18% of juveniles with the possibility of arrest. Overall, 38% of suspects were threatened or commanded by police in regards to at least one of these things.

More coercive police behaviors captured with these data included issuing a citation to the juvenile for some wrongdoing, telling the juvenile's parents or guardians about a wrongdoing, and what is categorized as the 'most' coercive police action: making an arrest. Very few juvenile suspects (3%) were issued citations but a significant number were subject to having their parents or guardians told about their participation in some problem. Police decided to tell the parents or guardians of juveniles, about a suspected wrongdoing, in almost 16% of cases as a way of dealing with the problem. While this is not considered a formal police response, like arrest, this response is one which could have more serious outcomes for the juveniles who now have to deal with their parents at home (and subsequent punishment and outcomes). Police are indeed aware that if they tell parents about the problem, these juveniles may receive some parental sanctions at home. This is a more coercive response from police, it carries more weight than threats and investigative tactics and in most cases

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

it involves more effort on the part of the police (they may have to place a call or drive to the juvenile's home to speak with parents). Buerger and Mazerolle (1998) would describe this behavior as 'third party policing' as police mobilize another person (in this case the juvenile's parent) to help them solve the problem. Police are not only imposing authority on suspect youth, they are also asking a civilian to take a role in minimizing the youth's misconduct. As mentioned earlier, 12.8% of suspects were taken into custody for the purpose of being charged, this is labeled 'arrest' in Table 5-19.

The difficulty in measuring police authority in a way that is suitable for multivariate analysis is discussed in detail in the previous chapter. As noted, one could measure police authority as a continuous variable (making it suitable for a least squares analysis), as an ordinal variable (making it suitable for an ordered logit analysis), or as a nominal variable (making it suitable for a multinomial analysis). Arrest, one form of authority, will be measured separately as a dichotomous dependent variable, and it will be analyzed as a single decision using the logistic regression technique. It will also be part of the more inclusive measure of police authority.

The table showing the frequencies of coercive police behaviors (Table 5-19) is quite exhaustive and it presents at least one real problem to any attempt to create an inclusive measure of authority: the need for a parsimonious measure. Given the information presented in Table 5-19, it is difficult to create a measure of police authority that is analytically tractable without losing too much of what is seen in the table. An interval measure of the 'quantity' of police authority used by police against each suspect is presented in Table 5-21. This measure is created by summing the numeric assignments (as presented in the previous

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

chapter) to the individual behaviors. This means, for example, a juvenile who was searched (2), threatened in some way (3), and arrested (5) would have an authoritative index score of a ten (10). Creating this measure does not result in a loss of the information presented in Table 5-19, but the assumptions of measurement (as discussed in the previous chapter and seen in Table 5-19) are a concern. Analysis of this variable regressed on the independent variables would be interpreted in terms of more or less authority.

A more parsimonious measure of police authority is presented in Table 5-22. This table presents a measure of authority that is created by collapsing individual police behavior into categories that match their assigned level of coerciveness. Juvenile suspects who were not subject to any of the police behaviors measured in Table 5-19 are represented in the "Release" category in Table 5-22. Police behaviors assigned a value of (1) in Table 5-19 (inquiring, listening, suggesting or requesting, lecturing, stopping juvenile from telling their side) are collapsed into a single category labeled "Requests" in Table 5-22. Behaviors that had been assigned a value of (2) (taking a report, interrogating, searching, handcuffing) are collapsed into a single category labeled "Investigate" as seen in Table 5-22. All commands and threats toward juveniles, assigned a value of (3) in table 5-19, are labeled "Command/Threat" on Table 5-22, the issuance of citations and telling juveniles' parents (assigned a value of 4 in Table 5-19) are combined into one category labeled "Citation", and arrest in Table 5-19, remains "Arrest" in Table 5-22.

The column labeled "overall frequencies" presents a simple count of how many juveniles were subject to at least one behavior in that category. Approximately 80% of suspects were subject to the lowest level of police authority, displayed here in the 'Requests'

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

category. Police used more coercive, investigative, tactics with 60% of suspects, and they issued commands and threats to almost 40%. Police chose to issue a citation or tell the suspect's parents about the problem almost 20% of the time. Only 13% of suspects were arrested, but police clearly used many forms of authority to handle these suspect youth. These categories of police behavior, as they are shown in the 'overall frequencies' column in Table 5-22, simplify the measure of authority (one of the problems to address in making an analytically tractable measure) but one must also address a second problem: mutual exclusivity. To create an analytically tractable measure, the column labeled "scaled frequencies" utilizes the categories displayed in the 'overall frequency' columns but only counts the most authoritative behavior police imposed on each suspect. This means that if a police officer searched a juvenile suspect, threatened them in some way, and then made an arrest, only the arrest would be counted in this measure - because it is the most coercive behavior imposed.[51] This measure is best for model parsimony and much of the analysis of police use of authority will rest on this measure.

[51]One could effectively argue that this measure loses the 'context' of police behavior as it actually occurs in police-juvenile interactions. One might also argue that perhaps it is only the 'most authoritative' behavior that matters to both the officer and the juvenile. So, if a juvenile is questioned, threatened, and then has his parents told, in a real sense; only 'having their parents told' matters (to the police and the juvenile).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Support and Assistance

In addition to the authoritative dimension, it is expected that some police behavior will be supportive in nature and that this behavior might be identified as a dimension separate from authority. It is expected that police will provide support and assistance to some of the juvenile suspects they encounter. The previous chapter reviewed how this dimension would be operationalized by presenting the police actions that were captured to measure the supportive dimension of behavior. Table 5-20 displays the frequencies and percent distributions for the supportive police responses. The individual supportive behaviors are listed in order, as they were in Chapter 4, from least to most supportive. Supportive responses varied from complying with a juvenile's request, to providing some information on how to deal with the problem, to police providing comfort and sympathy.

Though there is variation in the supportive dimension, it is not as widespread as that noted in the authoritative dimension. While these supportive behaviors are employed, they do not occur as often as the authoritative behaviors. This is expected and might be partly explained by the idea that police are typically thought to explicitly identify with the coercive part of their role, and only latently with the supportive dimension (Cumming et.al., 1965). Inasmuch as this is true, one might expect police to respond more often to situations with coercion and less often with support (especially with suspects). However, as discussed earlier, one might expect that contemporary police officers identify more often (in a general sense) with the supportive dimension of their role as community policing ideals penetrate police departments. If this is the case then we could expect to see police responding to problems by offering some support and assistance.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

These data indicate that, while police do respond at times with support and assistance, they respond more often with coercion. An extremely small percentage of juveniles, (just over 1%), requested that police provide physical assistance or information on how to deal with the problem. If a juvenile did make such a request, police usually complied (usually fully complied). Out of the 17 requests received by police, only two requests were not met at least partially. In these two instances the police officer explicitly refused to comply with one request while the other request was simply ignored.

Police were much more likely to provide information on their own initiative to juvenile suspects about how they might be better able to deal with a particular problem. Almost 20 percent of juveniles were recipients of this kind of information (see Table 5-20). Fewer than 5 percent of juveniles were recipients of some kind of officer initiated physical assistance. Police did offer comfort and sympathy to some suspects, but these responses occurred infrequently, less than 5 percent of the time. Overall, about one quarter of suspects were the recipients of at least one of these forms of support or assistance. Comparatively, almost 95% of juveniles were subject to some form of police authority and over three quarters of suspects were subject to what might be considered high levels of coercion, ranging from investigative tactics to commands and threats, and at times arrest.

Just as measurement issues arise for the authoritative measure, they also are a concern for a measure of police support. Again, when constructing a variable suitable for multivariate analysis, one must balance analytical tractability with the need to accurately represent what is happening in the real world. These concerns were discussed in the previous chapter as well. The behaviors captured for the supportive dimension are shown in Table 5-

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

20. From this, one must create a parsimonious and mutually exclusive measure. Because the data reveal that very few juveniles (17) requested either information or physical assistance from police, police responses to these requests will not be included in the measure for multivariate analysis. Little is lost by excluding these behaviors.

One way to create a parsimonious and mutually exclusive measure is to create a dichotomous variable where a value of (0) indicates that police did not offer any of these forms of support or assistance to suspects and a value of (1) indicates that police offered at least some form of support during the interaction. As stated above, approximately one quarter of suspects are in the (1) category as having received at least some form of support or assistance from the observed officer. A dichotomous measure in this instance does make some sense. The infrequent rate at which these behaviors occur (unlike the coercive actions) mean that one is not losing too much by using the dichotomous measure. However, given the variation (though slight) in these police actions (some juveniles were recipients of different types of assistance/support than others), one could create a nominal measure as well.[52]

Table 5-23 presents a nominal measure of support and assistance by police. This measure simplifies the information seen in Table 5-20 (it also excludes the compliance behaviors) by creating three categories of police behavior: no support; providing helpful

[52]A continuous measure was also created and a decision was made not to analyze this measure because it did not differ significantly from what is captured in the dichotomy. A value of (1) was imposed on each individual behavior listed in Table 5-20 (excluding the compliance behaviors), similar to what was done for the continuous measure of authority, and the occurrence of multiple actions toward each juvenile was summed to create the index. The index ranged from 0 to 4 but 95% of juveniles fell in either the (0) or (1) level (this would be captured in the dichotomous variable). Only 35 juveniles were recipients of two supportive actions or more; two juveniles were recipients of all four supportive actions.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

information on their own initiative; and providing physical assistance, comfort, or sympathy. The columns labeled "overall frequencies" presents a count of how many juveniles were recipients of at least one behavior in that category. Police offered information to 19% of suspects, and they offered physical assistance, comfort or sympathy to about 9%. The column labeled "scaled frequencies" uses the same categories but makes them mutually exclusive by counting the most supportive behavior to which juveniles were subject. While providing physical assistance, comfort, and sympathy might not all qualify as being the same behaviors, they do represent more support than merely providing information; and one could argue that they are similar in their degree of supportiveness. For multivariate analysis, the dichotomous measure of support and this trichotomy will be regressed on the independent variables. If results using the trichotomous measure reveal nothing additional about police interactions with juveniles, than the analysis of the dichotomous measure of support, the remaining focus will be on interpreting results generated using the binary measure.

In the next two chapters hypotheses about how police use of authority and provision of support relate to officers' backgrounds and attitudes, as well as the situations to which police are presented, will be tested at the citizen level of analysis. Multivariate analysis will be done in order to estimate the main effects of the explanatory variables presented in this chapter.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-1
Descriptive Statistics of Police Officers' Personal and Background Characteristics

Characteristic	Number	Percentage
Sex		
Male	329	83.1
Female	67	16.9
Race		
White	317	80.9
Minority	75	19.1
Education		
High School or Less	64	16.4
Some College	152	38.9
Bachelors and Higher	175	44.8
Training		
Community Policing Concepts		
Less than 1 Day	87	22.3
1 to 2 Days	148	37.9
3 Days or More	156	39.9
Mediation		
Less than 1 Day	279	71.0
1 Day or More	114	29.0
Assignment		
Run Officer	352	88.9
CP Officer	44	11.1

	Mean	SD	Range
Length of Service (Years)	7.4	6.3	32

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-2
Officers' Views of Citizens: Would Citizens Call the Police if They Saw Something Suspicious

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Most	159	40.6
(2) Some	154	39.3
(3) Few	79	20.2
(4) None	*	*

Table 5-3
Officers' Views of Citizens: Would Citizens Provide Information to Police

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Most	104	26.5
(2) Some	128	32.7
(3) Few	147	37.5
(4) None	13	3.3

Table 5-4
Officers' Views of Citizens: Would Citizens Work w/Police on Neighborhood Problems

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Most	65	16.6
(2) Some	178	45.4
(3) Few	147	37.5
(4) None	2	.5

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-5
Officer Cynicism: Additive Index of Views of Citizens

Index Score	Number	Percent
3	33	8.4
4	58	14.8
5	65	16.6
6	53	13.5
7	73	18.6
8	53	13.5
9	54	13.8
10	1	.3
11	2	.5

Alpha score = .74

Table 5-6
Officers' Attitudes Toward Aggressive Tactics

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Disagree strongly	19	4.8
(2) Disagree somewhat	69	17.5
(3) Agree somewhat	193	49.0
(4) Agree strongly	113	28.7

Table 5-7
Officers' Attitudes Toward Selective Enforcement

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Never	6	1.5
(2) Rarely	72	18.4
(3) Sometimes	251	64.0
(4) Often	63	16.1

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-8
Officers' Attitudes Toward Assisting Citizens

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Disagree strongly	*	*
(2) Disagree somewhat	7	1.8
(3) Agree somewhat	78	19.9
(4) Agree strongly	306	78.3

Table 5-9
Officers' Perception of Enforcing the Law Being the Most Important Responsibility

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Disagree strongly	9	2.3
(2) Disagree somewhat	55	14.0
(3) Agree somewhat	192	48.7
(4) Agree strongly	138	35.0

Table 5-10
Officers' Attitudes Re: How Often Police Should Handle Public Nuisances

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Never	4	1.0
(2) Sometimes	154	39.5
(3) Much of the time	142	36.4
(4) Always	90	23.1

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-11
Officers' Attitudes Re: How Often Police Should Handle Neighbor Disputes

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Never	7	1.8
(2) Sometimes	102	26.3
(3) Much of the time	141	36.2
(4) Always	140	35.9

Table 5-12
Officers' Attitudes Re: How Often Police Should Handle Family Disputes

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Never	2	.5
(2) Sometimes	78	20.1
(3) Much of the time	129	33.2
(4) Always	179	46.1

Table 5-13
Officers' Attitudes Re: How Often Police Should Handle Litter and Trash Problems

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Never	127	32.6
(2) Sometimes	217	55.6
(3) Much of the time	31	7.9
(4) Always	15	3.8

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-14
Officers' Attitudes Re: How Often Police Should Handle Parents Who Don't Control their Kids

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Never	54	13.8
(2) Sometimes	201	51.5
(3) Much of the time	107	27.4
(4) Always	28	7.2

Table 5-15
Officers' Attitudes Re: How Often Police Should Handle Nuisance Businesses

Response	Number	Percent
(1) Never	30	7.7
(2) Sometimes	129	33.1
(3) Much of the time	137	35.1
(4) Always	94	24.1

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-16
Officers' Role Conception: Additive Index of Role Items

Index Score	Number	Percent
9	1	.3
10	6	1.5
11	7	1.8
12	39	10.1
13	47	12.1
14	34	8.8
15	45	11.6
16	54	13.9
17	31	8.0
18	36	9.3
19	41	10.6
20	15	3.9
21	13	3.4
22	10	2.6
23	6	1.5
24	3	.8

Alpha score = .699

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-17
Juvenile Encounters: Characteristics of the Situation

Legal Factors:

Nature of the Problem	Number	Percent
Public Disorder	96	21.7
Nonviolent Crime	72	16.3
Traffic Offense	62	14.0
Violent Crime	47	10.6
Nonviolent Conflict	40	9.0
Suspicious Situation	30	6.8
Victimless Crime/Moral Offenses	24	5.4
Service	22	5.0
Medical/Dependents	21	4.7
No Problem	15	3.4
Information Exchange	9	2.0
Administrative	5	1.1
Seriousness of the Problem		
Minor Disorder/Service	42	9.5
Public Disorder	242	54.6
More Serious Disorder/Minor Prop.	75	16.9
Major Property/Personal Crimes	67	15.1
Major Violent Crime	17	3.8
Victim Requests		
(a) Requests Arrest	12	2.7
(b) Requests No Arrest	2	.5

Extra-legal Factors:

Who Initiated Encounter		
Observed Officer	203	45.8
Dispatcher	187	42.2
Other Officer or Supervisor	32	7.2
Citizen	21	4.7

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-17 Continued

Location			
Public Property	253		57.1
Police Facility	4		.9
Private Property	125		28.2
Mass Private	61		13.8
Minority Complainant			
White	390		88.0
Minority	53		12.0
Supervisor			
Not Present	418		94.4
Present	25		5.6
Neighborhood	Mean	SD	Range
Social Distress	40.0	19.7	5-106

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-18
Characteristics of the Juveniles

Legal Factors:		
Evidence (8 point scale)	Number	Percent
0	331	50.6
1	70	10.7
2	95	14.5
3	66	10.1
4	46	7.0
5	37	5.7
6	4	.6
7	5	.8
Use of Alcohol or Drugs		
No Evidence	612	93.6
Indication (No Visible Effects)	25	3.8
Behavioral Indications	17	2.6
Weapon Possession		
Any Weapon	8	1.2
Extralegal Factors:		
Suspect Race		
White	248	37.9
Minority	406	62.1
Suspect Sex		
Female	153	23.4
Male	501	76.6
Level of Wealth		
Middle Class or Above	275	42.0
Lower Class/Chronic Poverty	379	58.0
Demeanor		
Disrespectful	82	12.5
Prior Knowledge		
No Prior Knowledge	564	86.2
At Least Some Prior Knowledge	90	13.8

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-19
Police Behavior: Frequencies of Authoritative Behaviors (not mutually exclusive)

Police Action	Number	Percent
Inquiring into the Nature of Problem (1)	354	45.9
Listening to One/Both Sides (1)	387	59.2
Suggesting/Requesting/Persuading Juv to:		
Leave Area (1)	61	9.3
Cease Disorderly Behavior (1)	103	15.7
Discontinue Illegal Behavior (1)	55	8.4
Provide Information (1)	75	11.5
Lecturing (1)	144	22.0
Stopping Juv from Telling Their Side (1)	20	3.1
Taking a Report (2)	97	14.8
Interrogating (2)	314	48.0
Searching (2)	128	19.6
Handcuffing Without Arrest (2)	24	3.7
Commanding or Threatening Juv to:		
Leave Area (3)	45	6.9
Cease Disorderly Behavior (3)	100	15.3
Discontinue Illegal Behavior (3)	53	8.1
Provide Information (3)	4	.6
Threatening to Issue Citation (3)	40	6.1
Threatening Arrest (3)	120	18.3
Telling Juvenile's Parents/Guardians (4)	103	15.7
Issuing Citation (4)	19	2.9
Arrest (5)	84	12.8

Table 5-20
Police Behavior: Provision of Support/Assistance

Police Action	Number	Percent
Partially Complying with Juvenile Request	2	.3
Fully Complying with Juvenile Request	13	2.0
Providing Information on Own Initiative	127	19.4
Providing Physical Assistance on Own Initiative	20	3.1
Offering Comfort	32	4.9
Being Sympathetic	23	3.5

Table 5-21
Quantity of Police Authority: Continuous Measure

Authoritative Score	Number	Percent
0	38	5.8
1	23	3.5
2	53	8.1
3	84	12.1
4	92	14.1
5	57	8.7
6	46	7.0
7	41	6.3
8	37	5.7
9	28	4.3
10	34	5.2
11	28	4.3
12	20	3.1
13	12	1.8
14	18	2.8
15	13	2.0
16	6	.9
17	4	.6
18	4	.6
19	2	.3
20	6	.9
21	4	.6
22	1	.2
25	1	.2
27	1	.2
28	1	.2

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 5-22
Collapsed Measure of Police Authority (nominal)

Disposition	Overall Frequencies		Scaled Frequencies	
	N	%	N	%
Release	38	5.8	38	5.8
Requests	494	79.5	108	16.5
Investigate	397	60.7	163	24.9
Command/Threat	249	38.1	160	24.5
Cite/Tell Parents	120	18.3	101	15.4
Arrest	84	12.8	84	12.8

Table 5-23
Collapsed Measure of Police Support (nominal)

Disposition	Overall Frequencies		Scaled Frequencies	
	N	%	N	%
No Support	499	76.3	499	76.3
Providing Information	127	19.4	95	14.5
Physical Assistance Comfort/Sympathy	60	9.2	60	9.2

CHAPTER SIX

AN EXAMINATION OF POLICE AUTHORITY WITH JUVENILE SUSPECTS

This chapter will present an examination of police use of authority with juvenile suspects (i.e., the extent to which authority is a function of the situation, the juveniles, and the characteristics and attitudes of the observed officers). This examination will take two forms. First, as previous researchers have often operationalized police behavior in terms of the arrest decision, and because this disposition is important in its own right, arrest will be isolated, and the effects of sociological and psychological factors on arrest will be estimated. The second part of this chapter will examine more inclusive measures of police authority that reflect the range of behaviors discussed in Chapters Four and Five. These analyses will be done using LIMDEP software and the binary logit and multinomial logit technique, respectively.

Imposing Arrest

We know from the previous chapter that when police interact with juvenile suspects they seldom make an arrest. The analysis revealed that 13% of juvenile suspects were taken into custody for the purpose of charging.[53] This arrest ratio is similar to what researchers have reported in previous studies.

The examination of police arrest decisions looks first at the sociological model of

[53]When one excludes those cases where the juvenile had a warrant out for their arrest, the proportion arrested decreases slightly to 12.2%. A total of 14 juvenile suspects had a warrant out for their arrest. These cases are excluded from further analysis inasmuch as we must assume that police have no discretion in this instance; they must take the juvenile into custody.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

arrest (and tests only half of the propositions discussed in Chapter Three). The full, social-psychological model is presented second, which tests all of the hypotheses presented in Chapter Three. The results of the logit analysis can been seen in Table 6-1, which presents the estimated logit coefficients for each model with their standard errors shown in parentheses.[54] The explanatory factors, or independent variables, are listed vertically on the left side and the table presents each of the two models, labeled across the top horizontally (i.e., sociological and social-psychological model).

Sociological Model - Because previous researchers have so often focused on the sociological influences on police arrest decisions, arrest is initially analyzed in terms of this particular theoretical framework. In Table 6-1, this model is labeled at the top of the page as "sociological", and all of the encounter and juvenile characteristics are included in this equation - excluded are the officer characteristics and attitudes. When one looks at this model, a pattern emerges that is consistent with previous findings on police interactions with juveniles *and* adults. Five of the six parameter estimates that reach statistical significance, as denoted by the asterisks, confirm what previous researchers have reported; that is, the

[54]OLS is not used because the split in the dependent variable is dramatic with 88% in the 0 category and 12% in the 1 category. Problems that might arise if one were to use the OLS technique in this situation include: by fitting a line to this equation it is possible to have probabilities greater than one (this doesn't make sense logically); the error term is heteroschedastic so that the variance is not the same for each value of the independent variables; the standard errors are biased making the t-tests unreliable. The linear probability model might be sufficient to use if the split were 70/30 or less (closer to even).

For each model presented in Table 6-1 the model chi square values are well above the chi square critical values. We can clearly reject the null hypothesis that the restricted model (the model with only the intercept) and the full model (the model with the intercept and independent variables) fit equally well and conclude that at least one independent variable (in each model) has a significant effect on police decisions to arrest.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

probability of being arrested increases as the severity of the problem increases, as the amount of evidence reaches a level that is sufficient for probable cause to arrest, when the juvenile is disrespectful toward the police, when police have some prior knowledge of the juvenile, or when there is a weapon found. In addition, the presence of an officer's supervisor at the scene significantly influences the likelihood of arrest.

This arrest model was originally estimated with two additional variables about which were hypothesized in Chapter Three: victim requests for 'no' arrest and the number of officers at the scene. When the model was estimated, the effects of both variables were statistically significant. However, there was a question as to the temporal ordering of these phenomena and police decision-making. After going to the narrative accounts of the encounters where observers coded that a victim had requested NO arrest and where coding indicated that there were more than three officers present at the encounter, a decision was made to drop these variables from the model. In each case, victim requests for no arrest clearly occurred after the officer had already imposed the arrest disposition (thus the results showed that when this request occurred, officers were significantly more likely to arrest the suspect). The narrative accounts regarding the number of officers at the scene were not determinative; often descriptions of the additional officers were not included in the narratives. However, it seems plausible that the arrival of additional officers at the scene may be capturing something that the serious measure is lacking, and perhaps additional police arrive in anticipation of their need or because they were required to be there due to the seriousness (or potential seriousness) of the situation. It is believed that the model is better specified without these two variables. The effect of their removal is limited, the only

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

difference to the additional parameter estimates is the statistical significance of suspect demeanor- which appears to have been suppressed by the 'number of officers' variable. The following write-up, and the tabular presentation of results are without the inclusion of these two variables.

A "typical" police-juvenile interaction might be described as a case where each of the independent variables are at their most frequent or 'modal' value (see Tables 5-17 and 5-18 for the modal values for juvenile and encounter characteristics). In a typical police-juvenile interaction, for example, when the problem is of a non-serious nature, there is little evidence of wrongdoing, there is no supervisor present at the scene, and the suspect is deferential to police - the predicted probability of arrest is low at .03. As expected, legal factors significantly influence officers' decisions. Police are more likely to arrest when there is evidence sufficient for probable cause and when the suspected offense is a serious one. The probability of arrest rises to .15 when there is evidence sufficient to warrant probable cause. At this level of evidence, if the problem is a bit more serious than a typical minor public disorder (i.e., classified as a serious public disorder or minor property crime) the probability of arrest rises to .22. The probability of arrest is even higher (.33) if the juvenile is suspected to be involved in a major property or personal crime. These two legal factors clearly have an impact on police decisions to arrest.

We cannot reject the null hypothesis of a zero effect in regard to two other legal factors: use of alcohol or drugs and victim preference for arrest. While it is expected that police will be more likely to arrest juveniles who appear to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs (inasmuch as consuming alcohol and using drugs constitute illegal activities), no

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

relationship is found. In addition, victim requests for arrest do not influence police arrest decisions. One might suppose that the relationship between police arrest decisions and victim preference are different for juveniles than they are for adults. Certainly, one should not draw any definitive conclusions about the influence of victims' preferences from this analysis as the measures do not capture enough variation. Very few victims requested anything at all of the police and as a result, a larger sample size would be necessary to better understand the true relationships.

Several other situational factors have an impact on police arrest decisions: presence of a supervisor, juvenile demeanor, knowledge of the suspect prior to the encounter, and the presence of a weapon. When a police supervisor is at the scene of a police juvenile interaction the probability of the juvenile being arrested increases. While having sufficient *evidence* to warrant an arrest clearly influences officers' decisions, if in addition to having evidence sufficient for probable cause, a supervisor is present at the scene, the arrest probability increases to .43. As hypothesized, police might feel greater discretionary power if a supervisor is not present and might feel a greater need to go by the book and apply the

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

amount of authority called for once a supervisor arrives.[55] It appears that police are clearly influenced by the presence of their superiors.

It was hypothesized that when officers have knowledge of a juvenile prior to the immediate encounter they will be more likely to take authoritative actions, including arrest. Evidence presented here supports this hypothesis. The probability of arrest rises a small amount to .06 when officers have some prior knowledge of the juvenile. Though the effect is weak, this does confirm the hypothesized relationship. The logic of this supposition is that if an officer knows a juvenile it is most likely for some trouble the juvenile was involved in on a previous occasion and this might contribute to the probability of arrest.

Considering previous research, perhaps the most surprising finding here is the weak effect of suspect demeanor. While the coefficient is in the hypothesized direction, and disrespectful suspects are more likely to be arrested, the coefficient barely achieves statistical significance at the one tail test. When one examines the Pearson correlation between arrest and juvenile demeanor, the correlation is statistically significant at a .000 level (though the

[55]Another question regarding causal ordering arose with regard to supervisor presence at the encounter (similar to the influence of the number of officers at the scene). For example, does a supervisor arrive at the encounter in *response* to an arrest, or is the supervisor at the encounter from the beginning perhaps to observe the officer or offer guidance if necessary. After reading the narrative accounts of encounters where the coding reflected that a supervisor was present, this variable was re-coded so that it did NOT receive a (1) if a supervisor appeared because an arrest had already occurred, or if they only appeared at the very end of the encounter, after dispositions had been imposed. In addition, there was also one situation where the supervisor was at the location of the encounter even before the observed officer arrived but the arrest decision had already been decided before any interaction with the suspects began, this too I re-coded as a (0) as the arrests were not influenced by the 'arrival' or presence of the supervisor. In addition, I re-estimated the model without this parameter and the only change was in the strength of the demeanor effect (it was significant at the two tail test without this variable); and, also, the model presented in tabular form (with the variable included) does a better job of correctly predicting arrests.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

coefficient itself is rather modest at .165). The crosstabulation of arrest and demeanor suggests a relationship as well: 26% of disrespectful suspects are arrested compared to 10% of respectful suspects.

Several other factors that have insignificant effects have substantive meaning. In contrast with what previous research suggests, females were no less likely to be arrested than males and minorities were no more likely to be arrested than non-minorities (when controlling for other factors). Although police interactions with males and minorities more frequently ended in arrest than interactions with females and non-minorities (14% vs. 7% and 13% vs. 10%, respectively), the difference is not the result of independent race or gender bias. In addition, juveniles who appeared to be from lower socio-economic backgrounds were treated no differently than middle class juveniles. Thus, there is no evidence here that police were influenced by suspect sex, race, or level of wealth.

Social Psychological Model - The main objective of this research is to explore the extent to which both situational and individual factors influence police behavior with juvenile suspects. To this point, only the situational model has been presented and, consistent with previous research, some legal and extralegal factors have been found to have substantively and statistically significant effects on behavior. To test the hypotheses of the complete social psychological model (the full model presented in Chapter Three), arrest was regressed on both situational and individual factors. Table 6-1 displays the results labeled as 'social psychological'. Once again, results indicate that in a typical police-juvenile encounter the probability of police making an arrest is low at .05.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Initially, what stands out in the full model, is that all of the factors that had an effect on the arrest decision in the original sociological model, are similarly influential here. The logit estimates and their standard errors do not vary much from model to model, indicating that the effects are stable across models, even when controlling for additional explanatory factors. When police have probable cause of wrongdoing, the probability of arrest increases to .25. The probability rises even more to .45 if the officer also has some prior knowledge of the juvenile. If a supervisor is present, the probability of arrest is .21, but it is .65 if police have probable cause *and* there is a supervisor present at the scene. Offense seriousness, the presence of a weapon, and juvenile demeanor all have effects similar to those reported in the previous analysis.

There is evidence here to support propositions about organizational effects on police behavior. Police in St. Petersburg were much less likely to arrest juveniles than officers working in Indianapolis. This finding is in the hypothesized direction. While both departments practiced community policing, IPD did espouse a more aggressive, broken windows, approach to policing and it is logical that IPD police might be more authoritative and use their discretion to make more arrests than the SPPD officers.[56]

[56]Because of the significance of the department variable I tried to allow the regression coefficients to vary across two subgroups of cases (separated out by department) to examine if there were other substantive differences across the two research sites. Unfortunately, the model would not converge for the St. Petersburg subgroup (there were only 16 arrests there (of the 203 juveniles) which meant little variation in the dependent variable). The regression coefficients produced for the Indianapolis group are very similar to those for the group as a whole. The differences include the positive effect of both training in community policing (officers with more training were more likely to make an arrest) and any signs of alcohol or drug use (IPD police were more likely to arrest if there is any indication of use). These findings do seem logical when one considers the type of community policing practiced at the Indianapolis PD, since it was more aggressive one might expect officers with more training to be more aggressive on the street. Similarly, signs of alcohol

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

It was hypothesized in Chapter Three that officers might vary in their behavioral response based on their background characteristics and attitudes. These findings suggest that officer characteristics and attitudes have little, if any, direct impact on police decisions to arrest (and the null findings here are not related to collinearity problems among these independent variables). These results do not allow us to reject the null hypotheses for officer race, sex, education, length of service, assignment, or training. It seems officer behavior does not vary based on these particular attributes. At least in terms of arrest, male officers do not differ from females, minority officers do not vary from non-minorities, and more educated officers respond no differently from less educated officers.

As hypothesized, female officers do arrest less often than male officers (9% compared to 13%), but the effect does not reach statistical significance. Non-white officers make slightly fewer juvenile arrests than white officers (9% compared to 13%), but the correlation between officer race and arrest is not significant. There is no support here for the hypothesized relationship between the race of the officer and arrest decisions.

The estimated effects of officer attitudes are statistically insignificant. Officers who are more cynical about citizens in general are not more likely to arrest juvenile suspects than their less cynical counterparts. In addition, it was expected that officers who attitudinally favor an aggressive policing style might be more inclined to make arrests. There is no evidence of that here, though the parameter estimate is in the hypothesized direction. Further, officers who favor selectivity do not vary in their arrest practices from officers who do not

---

or drug use might give police at IPD the reason they need to go ahead and take the juvenile into custody.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

favor selectivity and officers' perception of their role and their attitudinal agreement or disagreement about assisting citizens have no direct bearing on their arrest decisions.[57]

To summarize, the findings suggest that, with regard to arrest, police today are influenced by many of the same factors reported years ago by Black and Reiss (1966) and Lundman, Sykes and Clark (1978), and more recently by Worden and Myers (1999). The seriousness of the problem and the strength of the evidence have a significant impact on police arrest practices. Police are more likely to make an arrest when the problem is serious and the available evidence is strong. Police are also more inclined to make an arrest when there is a weapon present at the scene, if the juvenile is disrespectful, and if they recognize or know the juvenile suspect. In addition, these findings also suggest that police are significantly influenced by the presence of a police supervisor as police are more likely to arrest a juvenile if a supervisor is present at an encounter and this influence is independent of offense seriousness, evidence strength, and juvenile demeanor. In addition, police did not impose arrest based on suspect race, sex, or level of wealth. While minorities, males, and juveniles from lower socio-economic backgrounds were arrested more often, there is no independent effect found between these factors and police arrest decisions. Finally, some organizational differences are revealed in the analysis, as officers in SPPD were much less

---

[57]In addition, the full model was run again with the inclusion of the dummy variable for officers who are selective and not aggressive (with the main effects in the model). The results did not change and officers who attitudinally favor selective enforcement and who are not aggressive were no different in making arrests than officers who were not selective and not aggressive. When this model was run without the main effects, selective, not aggressive officers, did not vary from the other three variations of these two attitudes and the parameter estimates for the other explanatory factors remained stable.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

likely to make arrests than IPD officers, independent of all of the other factors in the model.[58]

Juvenile Status and Implications for Arrest

The legal age of adulthood for both Indiana and Florida is 18. In both states, the juvenile court has jurisdiction over cases where the person alleged to have committed the offense is found to be less than 18 years of age (see Article 30, Sections 1-11 of the Indiana Code and Title XLVII, Chapter 985 of the Florida Statutes). Exceptions do exist if the alleged offense is of a serious nature (i.e., murder), but the majority of cases analyzed here would not meet that criteria. The cases of juvenile suspects in this data file include suspects of the ages 6 through 17. If the age of adulthood in either of the two states had been lower, age 17 for example, one might have hypothesized that if the suspect was 17 the police might be more likely to make an arrest. Although this is not the case, one might still expect to see some effect of age on police decisions to arrest; for example, perhaps police are more likely to arrest older suspects and more likely to give younger suspects a break by not taking them into custody.

The narrative data were reviewed to determine the exact age of those juveniles encountered, and observers were able to note the specific age of juvenile suspects in 384 cases. Given this, the full social psychological model was estimated on this subgroup of

[58]A final, reduced model of arrest decisions was estimated that removed from the equation any substantively and statistically insignificant variables from the full model. This was done to check the stability of the coefficients and to present a more parsimonious model of police arrest behavior. An examination of the reduced model reveals findings markedly similar to the full social psychological model. All of the parameter estimates that reached statistical significance in the full model are significant in the more parsimonious model and the strength of the demeanor effect achieves statistical significance at the two tail test. Further, the standard errors for the coefficients are very similar, suggesting that the model has some stability.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

cases with the inclusion of a dummy variable coded (1) if the juvenile was seventeen and (0) if they were less than seventeen. There was no significant effect of juvenile age when tested in this way; and coding the dummy variable (1) if the juvenile was *sixteen or seventeen* did not change the results. A final model was estimated with the inclusion of a continuous variable which captured the juveniles' age in years and still the effect did not significantly influence police arrest decisions. The coefficient was positive and almost significant at the one tail test (coeff = .167 (SE = .105)), indicating that as the age of the juveniles encountered increases police might be more likely to make an arrest. Overall, these analyses suggest that in making arrests, police are not strongly influenced by the suspect's age - rather they are attuned to those factors that were found to be substantively and statistically significant in the previous discussion of arrest.

Police Authority: Beyond Arrest

While arrest alone might be considered the most coercive police action, it is not the only tool police have to restore order and solve problems. Even when a police-juvenile encounter does end in arrest, police may have tried something else to take control of the situation. Further, as discussed in Chapter Five, when an arrest is not imposed, it is likely that the officer did something (used their authority in another way) to resolve the encounter. This might include, for example, making requests, asking questions, issuing commands or threats, or telling the juvenile's parents. In the previous chapter, a nominal measure of police authority was presented and displayed in Table 5-22. As mentioned, much of the analysis of

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

police authority rests on this measure.

Two sets of analyses were performed, one which treats the measure of authority as ordinal in nature, and another which treats the measure as nominal. Only the nominal level analysis will be presented here in the text, because the ordered logit results (which treat the measure of authority as ordinal) masked some of the true relationships between police authority and the explanatory factors.[59]

Because only 6% of cases fell in the release category (see Table 5-22), this category and the 'requests' category were combined to form the reference category for the multi-variate, nominal, analysis (see Table 6-2). This makes the most sense for analysis as the original reference category was too small and the behaviors captured in the 'requests' category are the least authoritative in the measure. This means that for the nominal level analysis, increases or decreases in the likelihood that police impose the authoritative behaviors captured in the additional categories (i.e., investigate, commands and threats, telling parents or issuing a citation, and arrest) will be compared to being released *or* having one of the minimally coercive actions occur (e.g., inquiries about the situation, suggestions, requests).The reference category will be labeled 'requests/release', keeping in mind that 93% of the reference category consists of juveniles to whom police made requests, suggestions, inquiries and lectures. The remainder of the juvenile suspects were outright released.

Table 6-3 is a two page table which displays the results of the multinomial analysis

[59]For example, the nominal results show that officers in SPPD and IPD use their authority in significantly different ways (i.e., SPPD police are more likely to investigate, more likely to tell parents, and less likely to arrest juvenile suspects (rather than release) than officers in IPD), while the ordinal results suggest that officers in the two departments do not vary at all in their behavior.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

of the nominal authority scale; the first page displays the effects of the situational factors on authority and the second shows the effects of the officer characteristics and attitudes. There were four analyses done on the nominal measure of authority. In the first column, the original multinomial analysis is presented where the reference category (labeled across the top) is "release/requests", and the likelihood of juveniles being subject to each additional category of behavior (investigate, commands and threats, telling parents, arrest) is compared to being in the release/request category. The coefficients for each disposition category are presented (labeled as investigate, commands/threats, telling parents, arrest). The next three columns present the additional analyses of authority which compare the likelihood of each category of police behavior occurring to all of the other categories of behavior by changing the reference category to investigate (results shown in second column), commands and threats (third column), and telling parents or issuing a citation (fourth column).[60] This allows for an in depth examination of police authority which illustrates the influence of the independent variables on each category of behavior when compared to all to other categories (not just the original (0) release/request category). While the main discussion of the findings will center on the results presented in the first column, where release/requests in the reference category, when the results from the additional equations are of substantive importance, they will be

[60]Please note that as the reference category is changed for each additional analysis of authority, one less set of categorical results are displayed (this is why the columns decrease in size each time) because in effect, each additional equation produces a portion of the estimates from the previous equation (and so the results are identical, and thus left off the tables). For example, in the investigate column (second column) there are no estimates presented which compare the likelihood of a juvenile being investigate to the likelihood of being in the release/request category, because these results were presented in the first column.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

discussed as well.[61]

Several things can be inferred from this analysis. First, police officers are more likely to take any of these actions, rather then simply issue requests or release the suspect, when they have more evidence and as the seriousness of the problem increases. The influence of these two legal factors are in the hypothesized direction and this suggests that, while police do not always make an arrest when the evidence is strong and the problem is serious, they are likely to use their authority in other ways rather than just releasing suspects or issuing requests. In addition, when police have evidence sufficient for probable cause to arrest, they are also significantly more likely to arrest than they are to merely investigate suspects, issue commands and threats, or tell the juvenile's parents. Police are also more likely to issue commands and inform the juvenile's parents of the problem, than they are to merely investigate by asking questions or performing searches. Similarly as the seriousness of the problem increases, police are significantly more likely to arrest than they are to merely investigate, issue commands and threats, or inform parents of the juvenile's wrongdoing.

Another legal factor, the apparent use of alcohol or drugs, had rather insignificant effects on police behavior. Police were significantly more likely to issue commands and threats to juveniles who appeared to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs, but police

[61]The model chi square value is well above the chi square critical value. We can clearly reject the null hypothesis and conclude that at least one independent variable (in each model) has a significant effect. In addition, to test the independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA) property, the models were also re-estimated by dropping a category of the dependent variable to see if the estimates and standard errors changed significantly. The parameter estimates on the remaining categories did not change significantly upon performing this analysis. See Long (1997) for a discussion of IIA.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

were not more likely to arrest, investigate, or tell the juvenile's parents than they were to simply release or issue requests and suggestions.[62] Unexpectedly, officers were also not influenced by victim preferences for arrest.

Second, police are less likely to investigate and tell juveniles' parents, rather than issue requests, if the complainant is a minority. The effect is not statistically significant for the command and threat category or the arrest category but the direction of these coefficients suggest that when the complainant is minority, police are less likely to take these actions as well. This relationship is in the expected direction, as it was hypothesized that police might take the concerns of minority complainants less seriously than the concerns of white complainants. This finding suggests that perhaps police accord less priority to complaints made from minority citizens, however, it might be that minority complainants request that police not do anything more than make requests or lecture the juvenile(s).

Third, the influence of a supervisor's presence on police behavior is not the same as it was in the arrest analysis. Here, police are no more likely to arrest a juvenile rather then send them home when a supervisor is present. This is interesting because the previous analysis of arrest decisions indicated that supervisor presence had a strong and significant influence over police decisions to arrest. Clearly, the reference category here is much

[62]The crosstabulation of the nominal authority scale and being under the influence of alcohol or drugs paints a different picture than the multinomial results. Of the juveniles who were thought to be under the influence, 8% were released, 13% were subject to some kind of investigative tactic, 26% were issued commands and threats, 29% had their parents told or were issued a citation, and 24% were taken into custody. The mutli-variate analysis does not reveal significant direct effects of this variable, however the parameter estimates for 'telling parents/citation' and 'arrest' are almost significant and one might consider the sample size here as a possible mask to the true relationships.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

different than it was for the previous analysis of the arrest decision, and this most likely accounts for the difference in results. While police are not more likely to arrest a juvenile than they are to send them home when a supervisor is present, the additional analyses (see the second and the forth column in Table 6-3) reveal they are more likely to arrest than they are to investigate or tell their parents. Police are also more likely to issue commands and threats to juveniles than they are to merely investigate.

In addition, the presence of a supervisor significantly influences police investigative behaviors; and it is in the opposite direction of that hypothesized. Police are significantly *less* likely to investigate, than they are to release or issue requests, when a supervisor is present at the scene (perhaps the presence of a supervisor deters officers from investigating as their presence offers an opportunity for mistakes to be pointed out). Also, there is some evidence here that indicates that the presence, or number, of civilian bystanders has an impact on police behavior. While police are no more or less likely to investigate, tell parents, or arrest juveniles than they are to release, police are significantly more likely to issue commands and threats as the number of bystanders increases. Perhaps police utilize this disposition more often when there are more citizens around because their presence is seen as an opportunity for things to get out of control - issuing commands and threats may help the officer gain control over the situation.

Somewhat related, when police *initiate* an encounter with a juvenile (rather than intervene at a citizen's request) they are more likely to issue commands and threats than they are to simply release or advise the suspect. When the model is estimated with each of the other categories as the reference group (0), when police initiate the encounter on their own,

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

they are also significantly more likely to issue commands and threats than they are to investigate, tell juveniles' parents, or arrest the suspect. This suggests that when police initiate an interaction with a juvenile (which means, more than likely, that no complainant is present), it is most likely going to end with an outcome no more authoritative than the issuance of a command or threat to the suspect.

Fourth, there is little statistical evidence that police are influenced by suspect race, sex, or level of wealth. Female suspects are treated differently from male suspects in that they are less likely to have police perform investigative tactics (e.g., they are more likely to be released), and this is most likely due to male police officers not searching female suspects. Juveniles of lower levels of wealth are treated no differently than middle class suspects. Given the history of police-minority relations, one might expect that police would use more authority with minority juveniles. The results here do not support this supposition and, in fact, the coefficients are in the negative direction for each category of behavior (when the reference group is release/requests), suggesting that police are less likely to investigate, issue command and threats, tell parents, and arrest (rather than release), if the juvenile is a minority. The effect of juvenile race on police decisions to issue commands and threats does achieve statistical significance (police are statistically more likely to release than they are to issue commands and threats to minority juveniles) and this finding suggests that police are, in actuality, more lenient with minority suspects than they are with white suspects. However, one might also surmise that police do not view the problems of minority juveniles seriously, and are not using their professional position to significantly deter future misconduct.

When the model is estimated using 'investigation' as the comparison behavior, the

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

results do suggest some bias toward minority suspects. Specifically, minority suspects are significantly less likely to be issued commands and threats than they are to be investigated. This might indicate that police "investigate" minority suspects more often than white suspects. Crosstabulations reveal that minority suspects were searched more often than white suspects (22% compared to 15%) but they were questioned by police at the same rate (also, minority and white suspects had a similar amount of evidence against them and minorities were not involved in a disproportionate amount of more 'serious' problems).

Fifth, unlike the results from the analysis of the arrest decision, the multinomial results indicate that when police have some prior knowledge of the juvenile suspect they are no more likely to take any of these actions than they are to simply release the suspect or make some kind of request or suggestion. The binomial analysis of arrest suggested that when juvenile suspects are known by the police, they are significantly more likely to be arrested than they are to be released. In the multinomial analysis, juvenile suspects who are known to the police are no more likely to be arrested (though the parameter estimate is in the hypothesized direction and approaches statistical significance) than they are to be released. However, juveniles who are known to the police are significantly more likely to be arrested than they are to be issued commands and threats (see third column results in Table 6-3). This generally suggests that having prior knowledge of a suspect does influence police behavior to some extent, and the relationship is in the hypothesized direction. This supports the hypothesis that if police have some knowledge of the suspect before the encounter, it is most likely for some kind of trouble the juvenile was involved in on a previous occasion.

Sixth, as hypothesized, police are more likely to arrest juveniles (rather than

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

release/make requests or investigate) who are behaviorally or verbally disrespectful toward them. The analysis also suggests that police are more likely to investigate, tell the juvenile's parents or issue a citation, or issue commands or threats, than they are to release or make requests - but these coefficients do not achieve statistical significance. The crosstabulation of the nominal authority measure with suspect demeanor supports these results. Suspects who were disrespectful were released less often (9% compared to 23%) and were arrested more often (26% compared to 9%). In addition, disrespectful juveniles were investigated on a more frequent basis (27% compared to 19%), issued commands and threats slightly more often (25% compared to 22%), and had their parents told of their wrongdoing or were issued a citation slightly more often (19% compared to 16%).

Seventh, there is evidence here to support hypotheses about organizational effects on police behavior. The department in which the officer worked has a substantive and significant effect on officer behavior. As with the previous analysis of arrest, these findings also suggest that SPPD officers are less likely to arrest juvenile suspects. In fact, SPPD officers are not only more likely to release or advise suspects rather than arrest, they are also significantly more likely to investigate, issue commands and threats, and tell juveniles' parents about the situation (than they are to arrest). What the analysis of arrest obfuscates, is that officers in the two departments vary in their behavior in other ways. When compared to IPD police, SPPD officers are *more* likely to investigate juveniles, and they are *more* likely to inform parents about some wrongdoing or issue citations, rather than investigating or just releasing the juvenile suspect. So, while SPPD officers are less likely to impose arrest, they are more likely to use their authority in other ways - indicating that they are doing something

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

to prevent future misconduct. Further, what SPPD officers do (particularly telling the juveniles parents) seems to fit with their less aggressive style of community policing.

Eighth, these findings indicate that officer characteristics have very little impact on their behavior. The race and sex of the observed officers have no significant impact on their use of authority. Minority officers do not significantly vary from white officers in their treatment of juvenile suspects - they are not significantly less likely than white officers to investigate, issue commands and threats, tell juveniles' parents, or arrest than they are to release or make requests. The coefficients are in the hypothesized direction, but they do not achieve statistical significance. The crosstabulation of officer race and the nominal authority measure also suggest that minority officers arrest juveniles less often than white officers (9% compared to 13%) and that they are less likely to tell juveniles' parents about the problem or issue a citation than white officers (10% versus 18%). Minority officers do not seem to differ from white officers in terms of their use of investigatory actions and their issuance of commands and threats to juveniles.

Female officers do not significantly vary from male officers in their use of authority. However, with the exception of the coefficient for arrest, where the reference category is release/request, all of the coefficients are positive (though not statistically significant), suggesting that female officers might be more likely to use their authority (rather than release) than male officers.[63] In addition, variation in officer education, length of service,

[63]The crosstabulation of officer sex and authority suggest that female officers choose to tell the juveniles' parents and issue citations less frequently than male officers (12% compared to 18%) and that they arrest less frequently as well (9% compared to 13%). Female officers do issue commands and threats to juveniles as frequently as male officers and they utilize investigative

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

assignment, and the amount of training in community policing have no independent effect on police authority - that is, variation in these factors does not make police any more or less likely to take any of these actions rather than release suspects.[64] Only one characteristic reaches a level of statistical significance in the original multinomial model (where release is the reference group): training in community policing concepts. Officers with more training in community policing concepts and principles are less likely than officers with less training to investigate juveniles, rather than just releasing them or making requests.[65] Additional effects of community policing training can be seen when the model is re-estimated with 'investigate' as the reference category (second column of results in Table 6-3). Juvenile suspects who interacted with officers with more training in community policing were more likely to be issued commands and threats, to have their parents told, and to be arrested than they were to be investigated. These findings are unexpected but perhaps this indicates that police with training in community policing training are trying to do something to curb the future misconduct of juvenile suspects and they may feel that issuing commands and threats and telling juveniles' parents are effective.

In addition to the effects of community policing training, this model also reveals some differences in police behavior due to variation in the amount of training officers have

---

tactics more frequently than male officers (39% compared to 23%). One might speculate though that this difference could be the result of male officers requesting for female officers to search female suspects.

[64]Officers with more education are significantly more likely (with a two tail test) to investigate suspects than they are to issue commands and threats.

[65]This effect is statistically significant only with a one tail test.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

received on mediation skills. When juveniles interact with police who have been skilled in mediation, they are significantly less likely to be issued commands and threats, have their parents told, or arrested than they are to be investigated. This makes substantive sense inasmuch as the "investigate" category captures officers' questioning of juveniles about their involvement in some problem, one might expect that officers whom are trained in mediation are better skilled in questioning and interrogation and that they take this approach more often.

Ninth, there is little evidence here to support hypotheses about the relationship between officer attitudes and police behavior. The previous chapter presented a discussion about the attitudinal variation among officers and it was apparent that officers do vary in how they perceive their role and the citizens they serve. It was hypothesized in Chapter Three that officers with similar attitudes about their work and citizens might behave similarly on the job, inasmuch as it makes intuitive sense that attitudinal proclivities might manifest themselves in behavioral responses. However, these findings suggest that officer decision-making is patterned by officer attitudes only to a very modest extent. There are few independent influences of officer attitudes on their behavior. Unexpectedly, officers with cynical outlooks about the helpfulness of citizens are less likely to issue commands and threats (or more likely to release a suspect) than officers with less cynical attitudes about citizens. In addition, when compared to the likelihood of being investigated, juveniles interacting with more cynical officers are significantly less likely to be issued commands and threats and less likely to have their parents informed than they are to be investigated. It was hypothesized that officers who were cynical about citizens in general would use higher levels

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

of authority and more authority with juveniles than those with less cynical views. There is some support for this hypothesis: when the reference category is changed to issuing commands and threats, juveniles who interact with police who have more cynical views of citizens are significantly more likely to be arrested than they are to be issued commands and threats by the officer. It is not clear what these results mean, perhaps cynical officers assess the situation quickly by investigating and asking questions and then quickly decide if the situation calls for an arrest. I would expect that officers with cynical attitudes would not spend a lot of time making this kind of decision. It may also be that the measure of 'cynicism', as it relates to officers views of 'citizen's willingness to help police', should be reconsidered.

Officers with a more expansive view of their role were significantly more likely to issue commands and threats (than they were to release, investigate, or issue commands and threats to suspects) than officers with a narrow role conception. Unexpectedly, officers with more broad conceptions of their role were significantly more likely to arrest than they were to tell juvenile parents. One would expect that police with broad conceptions of their role would more often utilize less authoritative and perhaps more innovative responses (like telling parents) to solve problems with juveniles and that perhaps they would use arrest as a last resort. The fact that officers with broad conceptions of their role are more likely to arrest than to tell the parents or guardians of juveniles' about problems is perplexing. Perhaps, practically, having broad views of their role means that officers are more likely to accept that dealing with juvenile problems is an important part of their job and, as a result, they are more likely to use their time to arrest juvenile suspects.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Finally, officers who believed more strongly that assisting citizens is as important as enforcing the law were more likely to take investigative actions than officers who did not agree as strongly about the importance of assisting citizens. Officers who varied in their attitudes about aggressiveness and selectivity were no more or less likely to behave in certain ways. And, officers who varied in their beliefs about the importance of enforcing the law did not vary significantly in their use of authority with juveniles.

Overall, the null effects of officer attitudes on behavior suggest that attitudinal proclivities might not transcend to behavior, and attempts to type officers by attitudes alone might not be a good representation of police behavior. With so few direct attitude-behavior relationships, combined with the weak effects of officer characteristics, one might conclude that police behavior with juvenile suspects is patterned largely by the situation to which they are presented. Or, perhaps police behavior with juveniles is patterned by factors that researchers have yet to identify.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Police Authority: Quantity

In addition to the multinomial analysis, these propositions are tested as they relate to the 'quantity' or 'amount' of police authority applied. To test hypotheses about how these explanatory factors influence the use of more or less police authority, authority was measured as a continuous variable by summing the assigned numeric scores for the occurrence of independent police actions (see Chapter 4 for a description and Table 5-21 in Chapter 5 for the distribution of this variable). The least squares approach is used to estimate the equation and the coefficients (and their standard errors) can be seen in Table 6-4. This analysis differs substantively from the multinomial analysis because police authority is measured here in terms of its 'quantity' or 'amount' and findings are discussed in terms of more or less (though how much more or less is not clear, see Chapter 4). Conversely, the multinomial analysis captured the 'most' authoritative police action imposed and compared the odds of the occurrence of that action to being released (or having some other less authoritative behavior occur). What is gained by analyzing the continuous measure of authority, is some information on those less authoritative actions taken toward juveniles who are also subject to more authoritative actions over the course of the encounter.

While considering the difference between the continuous and nominal approach to explaining police authority with juveniles, one should not be surprised to see similarities in the findings, inasmuch as one might expect that the factors found to have explanatory power in the nominal model might have similar influences in the continuous model. This might be especially true if, in the nominal model, the relationships between the independent variable and each category of the dependent variable are in the same direction (all positive or all

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

negative), and are statistically significant for one or more categories. If, however, in the multinomial model the relationship between an explanatory factor and categories of the dependent variable vary in their direction (for example, in the multinomial model 'department' had a *positive* and statistically significant influence on investigative tactics and telling parents, but a *negative* and statistically significant influence on arrest) then one might expect this relationship to be weak or insignificant with the continuous approach.

Indeed, the analysis of the quantity of police authority imposed does not reveal relationships that are strikingly different from the multinomial analysis.[66] As expected, police use more authority if some kind of weapon is found, when the evidence is strong enough to presume probable cause exists for arrest, and when the problem is a serious one. Police also respond to indications of alcohol or drug use, imposing more authority when juveniles appear to be under the influence.

As hypothesized, police utilize more authority when the juvenile is disrespectful. The influence of suspect demeanor is more apparent here than it is in the multinomial analysis. The coefficient is large and has a small standard error. This finding is consistent with previous research findings on the relationship between juvenile demeanor and police authority.

Police also impose more authority as the number of civilian bystanders at the scene increase. The only additional situational factors influencing police authority are whether or not the police knew the suspect in some way before the encounter began, and the juvenile's

[66]The R Square statistic suggests that this model explains 39% of the variation in police authority.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

level of wealth. As expected, police use more authority when the suspect is known to them. The relationship between the suspects' level of wealth and police authority is unexpected. It was hypothesized that juveniles who appeared to be from lower SES conditions might be the subject of more authority. The inverse relationship is seen here. Police use less authority with juvenile suspects of low levels of wealth than they do with those juveniles who seem to be from middle class or above. It might be that police consider the problems of poor juveniles as less serious than those from the middle class backgrounds - this might be because police feel parents of lower SES kids (as well as the neighborhood residents) care less about the problems these kids are causing than parents and neighbors of middle class kids. Or perhaps middle class suspects are seen as more malleable while suspects from lower levels of wealth are viewed as doomed for failure, less amenable to police intervention, and maybe headed for future trouble-making regardless of police efforts.

As with the multinomial analysis, officer characteristics and attitudes have little influence on the quantity of authority imposed by police onto juveniles. Officers with more training in mediation skills impose more authority than those with no training - however, the coefficient is extremely small. This result is not consistent with the analysis of police arrest decisions or the multinomial analysis, although the multinomial analysis did reveal that officers with more training were more likely to investigate suspects than they were to issue commands and threats, tell the juvenile's parents, or make an arrest. The influence of other officer characteristics and the department where the officer worked were all insignificant.

The influence of police attitudes on the quantity of authority used is minimal. The effects of two officer attitudes reach statistical significance in the model: police with more

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

broad conceptions of their role utilized more authority than officers with a narrow view of their role (this is consistent with what was found in the multinomial model); and, unexpectedly, officers who felt that enforcing the law was their most important responsibility imposed less authority than their counterparts. Both of these coefficients were significant with only a one tail test. One cannot reject the null hypotheses for any of the additional officer attitudes about which were hypothesized.

In conclusion, it appears as though police use of authority (generally speaking) is patterned, to a large extent, by the situation to which police are presented. Police use of authority is influenced only to a modest extent by officer characteristics and attitudes. Perhaps the attitudinal measures need to be reconsidered, the theoretical framework needs to be reworked, or perhaps police behavior is simply patterned by factors that researchers have yet not identified. Additionally, there is some evidence here that organizational influences on police behavior with juveniles are operating.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 6-1
Binary Logit Analysis of the Arrest Decision

	Sociological		*Socio-Psychological*	
	Coef.	**(SE)**	**Coef.**	**(SE)**
Encounter Characteristics				
Seriousness	.540**	(.156)	.615**	(.178)
Victim Requests Arrest	.708	(.826)	-.103	(.944)
Minority Complainant	-.217	(.578)	.218	(.640)
Supervisor Present	1.495**	(.550)	1.724**	(.631)
Officer Initiated	.044	(.354)	-.303	(.397)
Location	-.180	(.391)	.085	(.418)
# Citizens Present	-.000	(.020)	-.003	(.025)
Social Distress of Neighborhood	-.004	(.008)	-.012	(.011)
Juvenile Characteristics				
Evidence	1.681**	(.342)	1.914**	(.386)
Weapon	2.885**	(1.28)	3.344**	(1.56)
Minority	.367	(.377)	.249	(.404)
Female	- .603	(.442)	-.424	(.475)
Level of Wealth	.337	(.344)	.370	(.379)
Demeanor	.617*	(.383)	.770*	(.448)
Knowledge	.652*	(.405)	.931**	(.490)
Use of Alcohol or Drugs	.684	(.496)	.615	(.573)
Organization				
St. Petersburg	-----	-----	-1.77**	(.482)
Officer Characteristics				
Minority	-----	-----	.279	(.542)
Female	-----	-----	-.720	(.556)
Education	-----	-----	.327	(.311)
Length of Service	-----	-----	-.008	(.041)
Assignment (CP/Run Officer)	-----	-----	-.218	(.673)
CP Training	-----	-----	.101	(.280)
Mediation Training	-----	-----	-.693	(.502)
Officer Attitudes				
Cynicism	-----	-----	.140	(.113)
Aggressiveness	-----	-----	.193	(.236)
Selectivity	-----	-----	-.014	(.313)
Role Conception	-----	-----	.061	(.068)
Assistance	-----	-----	.006	(.449)
Law Enforcement	-----	-----	-.393	(.264)
Constant:	-4.472	(.588)	-5.800	(1.900)
Model Chi square value and (sig):	95.145	(.000)	123.39	(.000)

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 6-2
Collapsed Measure of Police Authority (nominal)

Disposition	Overall Frequencies		Scaled Frequencies	
	N	%	N	%
Release/Advise	532	81.4	146	22.4
Investigate	397	60.7	163	24.9
Command/Threat	249	38.1	160	24.5
Cite/Tell Parents	120	18.3	101	15.4
Arrest	84	12.8	84	12.8

Table 6-3
Multinomial Analysis of Police Authority

Reference Category:	*Release/Requests*				*Investigate*			*Commands/ Threats*		*Tell Parents*
	Investigate	**Commands/ Threats**	**Tell Parents/ Citation**	**Arrest**	**Commands/ Threats**	**Tell Parents/ Citation**	**Arrest**	**Tell Parents**	**Arrest**	**Arrest**
Encounter Characteristics										
Seriousness	.582**	.429**	.437**	1.013**	-.153	-.145	.431**	.008	.584**	.576**
Victim Requests Arrest	-1.705	-.273	.519	-.396	1.432	2.224*	1.309	.791	-.123	-.915
Minority Complainant	-.968**	-.840	-1.35**	-.596	.128	-.384	.373	-.513	.244	.757
Supervisor Present	-2.367*	-.102	-.621	.962	2.265*	1.745	3.328**	-.520	1.063	1.583*
Officer Initiated	-.519	.799**	-.364	-.351	1.318**	.153	.165	-1.165**	-1.150**	.014
Private Property	-.259	.281	.322	.168	.540	.580	.427	.041	-.113	-.153
# Citizens Present	.015	.869**	.047	.056	.072**	.032	.040	-.040	-.032	.009
Social Distress	-.000	.020**	.013	-.010	.020**	-.013	-.010	-.033**	-.030**	.003
								.563	1.547**	
Juvenile Characteristics								.241	.625	.984**
Evidence	1.33**	1.91**	2.47**	3.45**				-.332	-.567	.383
Minority	-.045	-.726**	-.484	-.101	.581*	1.144**	2.128**	-.250	.280	-.235
Female		-.653*	-.071	-.403	-.681*	-.440	-.056	.084	.586	.531
Level of Wealth		-.024	-.119	-.369	.583	.250	.015	.224	.923*	.502
Demeanor		.376	.733	.817	-.095	-.345	.186	-.068	.154	.699
Knowledge		.106	-.061	.163	.357	.442	.944*			.222
Alcohol or Drugs		.301	1.289*	1.221	-.167	-.057	.755			
					.989	.920	1.142			
									.805** -	
Organization									1.272**	-2.078**
St. Petersburg		.827**	.774	.883**						
				-1.196**	-.750*	-.055	-2.023**			

Table 6-3 (con't)
Multinomial Analysis of Police Authority

Reference Category:	*Release/Requests*			*Investigate*			*Commands/ Threats*		*Tell Parents*
	Investigate	**Commands/ Threats**	**Tell Parents/ Arrest Citation**	**Commands/ Threats**	**Tell Parents/ Arrest Citation**	**Arrest**	**Tell Parents**	**Arrest**	**Arrest**
Officer Characteristics							-.063	.525	
							-.589	-1.013	
							.171	.523	.588
Minority	-.185	-.579	-.642 -.051	-.393	-.457	.131	-.020	-.015	-.423
Female		.598	.758 .169 -.255	.160	-.430	-.853	.692	.752	.352
Education		.263	-.309 -.138 .214	-.572**	-.401	-.049	-.288	-.220	.006
Length of Service	.166	-.009	-.029 -.024	-.026	-.046	-.043	-.015	-.452	.060
Assignment (CP/Run)		.487	-.511 .180 .240	-.998*	-.306	-.246			.067
CP Training		-.387*	.308 .020 .087	.695**	.407*				-.437
Mediation Training	.607	-.302	-.317 -.755			.475	.153	.305**	
				-.909**	-.924**	-1.362**	-.052	.097	
Officer Attitudes							.404	.169	.152
Cynicism	.143	-.199**	-.046 .107				-.178**	-.030	.149
Aggressiveness		-.129	.037 -.016 .133	-.341**	-.189**	-.037	.092	.207	-.235
Selectivity		-.129	-.194 .230 -.254	.049	-.003	.146	.042	-.221	.148**
Role Conception	-.002	.127**	-.052 .097	-.065	.339	.104			.115
Assistance		.587*	.187 .279 .394	.128**	-.050				-.263
Law Enforcement	-.119	-.299	-.257 -.520			.098			
				-.401	-.308	-.193			
				-.181	-.138	-.401			
Model Chi Square Value and		355.323							
(Significance Level)		(.000)							

Table 6-4
Ordinary Least Squares Analysis of Police Authority

	Quantity of Authority	
Encounter Characteristics		
Seriousness	.283	(.193)
Victim Requests Arrest	1.017	(1.181)
Victim Request No Arrest	.887	(1.640)
Minority Complainant	.517	(.627)
Supervisor	1.211	(.815)
Initiation	.008	(.412)
Location	.426	(.430)
# Officers Present	.440*	(.242)
# Citizens Present	.376*	(.197)
Social Distress	-.014	(.010)
Juvenile Characteristics		
Evidence	3.732**	(.370)
Weapon	4.134**	(1.927)
Race	-.351	(.406)
Sex	-.504	(.429)
Level of Wealth	-.620*	(.368)
Demeanor	2.773**	(.538)
Knowledge	2.124**	(.526)
Alcohol or Drugs	1.967*	(.722)
Officer Characteristics		
Minority	.772	(.539)
Female	.042	(.515)
Education	-.292	(.285)
Length of Service	-.008	(.037)
Assignment (CP/Run)	-1.273*	(.686)
CP Training	.256	(.264)
Mediation Training	-.889*	(.479)
Department	-.514	(.424)
Officer Attitudes		
Cynicism	.138	(.102)
Aggressiveness	.238	(.248)
Selectivity	.429	(.300)
Role Conception	.009	(.063)
Assistance	.121	(.473)
Law Enforcement	-.349	(.266)
Constant	.933	(1.903)
R Square Statistic	.392	

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

CHAPTER SEVEN

AN EXAMINATION OF POLICE SUPPORT

In this chapter, police provision of support will be examined as a function of the situation and police characteristics and attitudes. While it is presumed that police officers explicitly identify with the authoritative side of their role, it is hypothesized that they implicitly relate to a supportive component as well. Police are service providers and the citizens they serve are their clients. While it is true that police officers must rely on their coercive authority to effectively do their job (see, for example, Muir (1977) and Bittner (1974)), one might expect that contemporary police officers might be better equipped than traditional police officers at utilizing the provision of support and assistance as a means to handle situations and solve problems. Police might provide helpful information, assistance, and perhaps some comfort or sympathy to many of the citizens with whom they interact.

With the implementation of community and problem oriented policing philosophies, perhaps officers are more responsive to community needs, and the assumption is that they are better trained at helping people with their problems. Providing troubled juveniles with information or referrals to other agencies that may help them with their situation might be the kind of responses that contemporary police utilize with greater frequency. Table 7-1 indicates that 23% of juvenile suspects were recipients of some police support or assistance. For 19% of juvenile suspects, police, on their own initiative, provided some helpful information to help them with their problem, and for 9% police either provided physical

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

assistance, offered comfort, or expressed some sympathy for the situation (see Table 7-2).[67]

The multi-variate analysis of police support will take two forms. The first examination will treat support as a dichotomous variable, coded (0) if the juvenile received no support and (1) if the juvenile was the recipient of any (at least one type of) police support. The second examination will treat support as a nominal variable where (0) indicates no support, (1) indicates that the highest level of support received was some helpful information, and a (2) indicates that the highest level of support provided was either providing some form of physical assistance, offering comfort, or being sympathetic to the juvenile's situation. Both equations will be estimated using Limdep software and the logit analytical technique.[68] For both equations, the reference group will consist of those juveniles who did not receive any support.

The Support Dichotomy

In examining police provision of support as having occurred, or not, the full social psychological model is tested. These data indicate that 23% of juvenile suspects were recipients of some kind of police support or assistance (see Table 7-1). The multi-variate analysis of the dichotomous support variable (full, social psychological model) indicates that in a typical police juvenile interaction (when the explanatory factors are at their modal

[67]Unfortunately, I do not have, or am aware of, any baseline data for comparisons, but these figures suggest that officers are indeed using these actions to help solve problems.

[68]In Chapter Five, it was discussed that these two sets of analysis would only be presented if significant differences emerged between the dichotomous and nominal analysis. There are enough differences revealed to warrant a discussion of both of the estimated equations.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

value), the probability of police providing any type of assistance or support is .17. This means, for example, that when the problem is of a minor nature (public disorder), there are no victim requests for police arrest action, the juvenile is a respectful, minority, male, and the officer is a white male with at least a bachelors degree, one in six juveniles are recipients of some form of police assistance. Table 7-3 displays the results of the social psychological model of police provision of support to juvenile suspects. The estimated logit coefficients are presented with their standard errors shown in parentheses. Similar to the models of police authority, the explanatory factors are grouped in terms of the characteristics of the encounters and juveniles (sociological factors), and the characteristics and attitudes of the observed officers (psychological factors).

Social Psychological Model - There are several key findings here to discuss, only some of which have to do with the statistical significance of the coefficients. First, and perhaps most striking, police use of support and assistance is patterned more by the individual characteristics of the officers than by the situation to which police are presented. This diverges from the findings with respect to the authority models (from Chapter Six) which found that police use of authority with juvenile suspects was patterned, to a large extent, by situational characteristics (e.g., seriousness of the problem, evidence strength, presence of a supervisor, juvenile demeanor). While it is true that some situational factors influence police decision-making regarding the use of support, it appears to be more the case that this behavior is patterned by officer characteristics. These findings are discussed in greater detail below.

Second, legal factors do have some influence on police provision of support and

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

assistance, but the direction of the effect is not always in the expected direction. As expected, when victims request that the juvenile be arrested, police are less likely to offer assistance or support to the juvenile suspect. In fact, when a victim requests an arrest the probability of police providing assistance to juveniles decreases, from .17 to .02, a substantive, and statistically significant, amount.

The findings regarding two significant predictors of police authority (i.e., problem seriousness and evidence strength) are unanticipated. We cannot reject the null hypothesis regarding problem seriousness as it does not appear to significantly influence police provision of support to juveniles. The effect of evidence strength is statistically significant, but the direction of the coefficient is curiously contrary to that hypothesized. The probability of police providing assistance to juvenile suspects doubles, from .17 to .34, when the evidence available is considered equivalent to that required for probable cause.[69] One might suppose that police are more likely to provide support in these situations because the juvenile is perceived to be more in need of guidance and assistance, and perhaps this is a result of the potentially more serious nature of the act - police may even be arresting these juveniles but comforting them and telling them that everything will be okay. It was hypothesized that juveniles who were in more serious trouble, and who had more evidence against them, might be less likely to receive assistance or support from police as they might be considered less deserving and perhaps more in need of some authoritative behavior rather than support. Apparently, this is not the case (although this is not to say that police are not likely to use

[69]Also, the coefficient for evidence strength is significant with a two tail test. The coefficient is rather large and has a small standard error.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

authority under these circumstances; one should keep in mind that juveniles involved in more serious problems and whom have more evidence against them are significantly more likely to be arrested).

Third, very few extralegal factors appear to influence police use of support. Police are influenced by juvenile demeanor, but the effect is contrary to the hypothesized relationship. It was expected that police might be less likely to offer assistance to juveniles who were disrespectful - as they would be seen as less deserving of police aid. However, these findings suggest that police are *more* likely to provide assistance in this situation, the probability of police offering assistance increases by .12 to .29 when the juvenile is disrespectful. Perhaps juveniles are disrespectful when they are in more serious trouble or feel hopeless about their situation. One might imagine that despite the juvenile's disrespect, police might still feel compelled to provide assistance to these troubled youths (and perhaps, police who are able to effectively do this, despite being disrespected, may be considered exemplary officers).[70] Or, there might be a time-order problem here, perhaps the support precedes the disrespect.

The only additional extralegal factor that is significantly related to police provision of support, the social distress level of the neighborhood where the encounter occurred, suggests that police are more likely to provide support to juveniles when the immediate environment is more distressed. This suggests that perhaps, as hypothesized, police are aware

[70]Without knowing the temporal ordering of juvenile disrespect and police provision of support, I suppose one might hypothesize that juveniles are disrespectful as a response to police trying to offer assistance (for example, police try to offer assistance and juveniles respond by saying they don't need/want their help).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

of the need for their assistance and support in this environment and that they might be trying harder to help/save juveniles in these areas.

Fourth, the effects of many officer characteristics have substantive and statistical significance. It was hypothesized in Chapter Three that both minority officers and female officers might be more likely to provide support to juvenile suspects than their white and male counterparts. We cannot reject the null hypothesis for officer race. While the coefficient is in the hypothesized direction and approaches statistical significance, we cannot conclude that minority officers behave any differently than white officers in regard to offering support. With respect to the relationship between officer sex and the provision of support, female officers do behave in a significantly different way than male officers (controlling for other factors), but the direction of the influence is opposite that of the hypothesized relationship. When the officer interacting with the juvenile is a female, the probability of the suspect receiving support or assistance *decreases,* a significant amount, from .17 to .07. This might be an indication that female police officers resist the traditional nurturing role that one would typically expect women to identify with in our society, perhaps trying to avoid being typecast as behaving like a maternal 'female officer' or, at the least, as behaving differently than their male counterparts. Despite their history of exclusion from the police profession, female officers may still be working to fit in with, rather than rejecting, the traditional aggressive policing style. This in turn could result in female officers overcompensating and identifying more so with the authoritative dimension of the role and less with the supportive dimension, and doing so to more of an extent than male officers. It might also be that females who are attracted to the police profession are somewhat different from those women in the general

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

population, who might not be interested in police work as a profession.

As expected, police officers with more formal education are more likely to provide support to juvenile suspects, as are officers with more on the job experience.[71] However, unexpectedly, community policing officers and officers with more training in community policing were significantly less likely to offer support and assistance to juvenile suspects than regular patrol officers (i.e., run officers) and officers with little or no training in community policing.[72] In fact, when the officer was a community policing specialist, the probability of the juvenile receiving any support or assistance decreased from .17 (in a typical case) to .01, a statistically significant decrease. These results, related to training that officers receive while on the job and their assignment as a patrol or community officer, indicate that police departments do have some effect on police behavior. Administrators and policymakers might want to seriously consider the effects of training on officers' behavior on the street.

There is additional evidence of an organizational effect here: officers also varied in their use of support according to the department in which they worked. Somewhat unexpectedly, SPPD officers were statistically significantly less likely to provide support to juvenile suspects than IPD officers. It was hypothesized that police officers in St. Petersburg might be more inclined to provide support because they were more entrenched in community

[71]This equation was also estimated using 3 sets of dummy variables for college education where one captured officers with a bachelors degree or higher, one captured officers with some college education but no bachelors degree, and one captured officers with no college education at all (this was the reference category). Both education dummy variables (i.e., bachelors degree or higher, some college education) were positive and statistically significant.

[72]Being trained in mediation skills had no effect on officer behavior. Police with training in mediation were no more or less likely to provide support than officers with no training.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

policing and they had embraced a citizen oriented/problem solving approach to policing; the Indianapolis police department had embraced a more hard nosed, aggressive, approach to community policing. There is no support for the hypothesized relationship here. The crosstabulation of police provision of support by department reveals that 18% of juveniles encountered in St. Petersburg and 27% encountered in Indianapolis received support or assistance, these statistics add support to the results of the mutli-variate analysis. When a police-juvenile interaction occurred in St. Petersburg, the probability of police offering support to juveniles was .09 less (.08) than it was in Indianapolis, other things being equal, a statistically significant difference.

Fifth, officer provision of support, like the use of authority, is not patterned to a large extent by officer attitudes. We cannot reject the null hypothesis for the majority of the expected relationships. In the multivariate analysis, the only officer attitude that has a significant influence on police behavior is officers' perception of their role, and the direction of the effect is contrary to the hypothesized relationship. It was expected that officers with a broader role orientation would be more likely to identify with, and accept, a supportive component of their role and, as a result, be more likely to offer support in encounters with juvenile suspects. There is no evidence here to support this supposition. In addition, variation in officers views of citizenry, aggressiveness and selectivity, assistance, and their view of law

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

enforcement, does not influence variation in officer behavior.[73]

An Intricate Look at Police Provision of Support: The Trichotomous Measure

This next examination of police provision of support presents a further breakdown of these behaviors by treating support as a trichotomous variable where (0) indicates no support was provided, (1) indicates that police provided some useful information to help the juveniles (but no comfort, sympathy, or physical assistance), and a (2) indicates that police provided support in the form of comfort, sympathy, or physical assistance. For this analysis, (0) (no support) is again the reference group. The findings are discussed below, and they are compared with the findings from the analysis of the dichotomous support variable, discussed

[73]When this model is estimated without the variable for the social distress level of the neighborhood, the parameter estimates for two additional officer attitudes reach statistical significance. Officers who are aggressive (dummy variable coded 1 for favoring aggressiveness) and officers who are selective but not aggressive (dummy coded 1 for favoring selectivity and not favoring aggressiveness) are more likely to offer support and assistance than their counterparts. The relationship for aggressiveness is unexpected but the other is in the expected direction. The difference discovered by omitting the variable for neighborhood distress level might be due to some interaction between neighborhood distress and officer attitudes, or it might be due to the fact that when the distress variable is included, an additional 30 cases are lost from the analysis due to missing data on that variable. The attitudinal estimates might simply be more stable with the additional 30 cases. The standard errors are relatively constant, but the parameter estimates themselves increase without the inclusion of the neighborhood distress level. The remainder of the relationships are relatively unchanged.

In addition, to test the stability of the model estimates, and to be sure that the independent variables that were insignificant were not masking the strength of the significant relationships, a reduced, more parsimonious, model was estimated. Only those variables that were statistically insignificant in the original social psychological model were omitted. However, some explanatory factors that were statistically insignificant remain in the reduced equation because of their substantive importance (i.e., the race and level of wealth of the juvenile, being under the influence of alcohol or drugs, the race of the officer). The only relatively important point to note here, is that the results from the reduced model do not reveal any significant changes from the full social psychological model, suggesting reliability in the initial estimates discussed above. The coefficients and their standard errors are remarkably similar from model to model.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

in the previous section. The results of this social psychological model are displayed in Table 7-4; the estimates for the dichotomous support variable are shown first (for easy comparison they are in the left two columns), and the analysis of the trichotomous support measure is shown in the right four columns with the two categories labeled across the top as 'information' and 'comfort/sympathy'.[74]

First, as with the dichotomous measure of support, the only legal factor influencing police provision of support is evidence strength. When police have more evidence of wrongdoing they are significantly more likely to provide both forms of support: *information* and *comfort, sympathy, or physical assistance*. What the analysis of the trichotomous measure of support reveals (that the analysis of the dichotomous measure obfuscates) is that the relationship between evidence strength and support appears to be stronger for the comfort and sympathy category than it is for the information category (the standard errors are similar in size, but the coefficient is larger for the provision of comfort/sympathy category), but we cannot be sure that the difference in the size of the coefficients is not due to chance. The seriousness of the problem and whether or not juveniles are under the influence of alcohol or drugs have no direct impact on police provision of support.[75]

---

[74]For the multinomial analysis, the model is presented without the variables for victim requesting arrest and community policing assignment (both of which were significant factors in the dichotomous model). These factors are excluded here because their estimates in the multinomial model were highly unstable with grossly enlarged standard errors. There were few changes to the parameter estimates and their standard errors when the model was re-estimated without these two variables. The exceptions include some changes in the statistical significance of some officer characteristics (i.e., gender, education and role orientation). These estimates were not statistically significant when these two variables were included, however and one might suppose that the estimates are more reliable without the omitted variables.

[75]However, when the model is estimated with "comfort/sympathy" as the reference category, the results show a relationship between provision of support and juveniles being under the influence

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Second, the extralegal factors found to influence police support in the dichotomous model, have a similar influence on support when it is measured as a trichotomy. However, some finer distinctions are teased out in this analysis. The impact of the social distress level of the neighborhood (where the encounter took place) is statistically significant only for the provision of physical assistance and comfort. As hypothesized, police are significantly more likely to offer physical assistance, comfort, or sympathy to suspects, rather than release them, when the encounter occurs in a more socially distressed neighborhood. This might be an indication, as speculated, that despite whatever trouble the juvenile might be in at the time, police consider the environment and still recognize the need for (or are compelled to provide) comfort or other supportive actions. Perhaps police suppose that the juveniles in these neighborhoods do not get much informal guidance or support (i.e., from family or the community) on a day to day basis.

Also, this analysis reveals a substantively and statistically significant influence of both juvenile sex and demeanor. Female suspects are significantly more likely to receive support from police than male suspects (rather than receiving no support), but this is only the case for the comfort/sympathy category. As expected, police are more likely to provide female suspects with comfort, sympathy, or physical assistance rather than just release them; police are not more likely to offer helpful information to female suspects than male suspects.

There is a similar occurrence regarding the impact of suspect demeanor. Unexpectedly, police are *more likely* to provide helpful information (the (1) category in the

---

of alcohol or drugs. Specifically, juveniles who are perceived to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs are significantly less likely to receive information from the police than they are to be receive comfort, sympathy, or physical assistance. They are no more or less likely to be released.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

trichotomy) to juveniles who are being disrespectful, rather than offering no support or assistance at all. Police are not more likely to comfort or be sympathetic (the (2) category) toward disrespectful suspects. It seems unlikely that police would be supportive or helpful at all when suspects are behaving in a disrespectful manner, however, this finer analysis of the dependent variable illustrates that while police are still more likely to provide information to these suspects, they are not more likely to offer physical assistance, comfort or sympathy. These supportive behaviors (comfort, sympathy, and physical assistance) might be considered, by their very nature, as more explicitly supportive than providing information to help with a problem. Certainly that has been hypothesized here. Offering physical assistance, comfort or sympathy seem supportive on a more personal level, one wouldn't expect police to go out of their way and behave in this way toward disrespectful youth.

Third, minority officers and female officers behave differently from white and male officers. As expected, minority officers are more likely to offer helpful information to juvenile suspects rather than offer no information or assistance. They are not more likely to offer physical assistance, comfort, or sympathy and, in fact, the coefficient for this category is in the negative direction, indicating that minority officers are less likely than white officers to offer comfort and assistance (but the coefficient does not reach statistical significance). Due to the inverse relationship between officer race and the two categories of support, the dichotomous analysis did not reveal these differences.

Unexpectedly, female officers are significantly less likely than male officers to either offer information or provide physical assistance, comfort, or sympathy than they are to

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

simply release a suspect. It was hypothesized that female officers would reject the more aggressive approach to policing (because of their history of exclusion from the police profession and the more nurturing role women traditionally and typically play in our society) and be more likely to identify with the more latent, supportive, side of policing. However, there is no evidence here to support these suppositions.

Fourth, officers' use of support is somewhat patterned, in one way or another, by their training and experiences - both on the job and outside of the profession. Provision of support to suspects is statistically influenced by the number of years worked as a police officer, the amount of police training they have had in community policing concepts, and by the amount of formal college education they have acquired. As expected, police are more likely to provide physical assistance, comfort, or sympathy to juveniles, rather than offer no support, as their years of service or level of formal education increase. Also as expected, more educated officers are also more likely to provide helpful information to suspects. However, unexpectedly, officers who received more training in community policing concepts were significantly more likely to simply release suspects rather than to provide them with some helpful information on how to deal with their problems. This is perplexing as one would expect that part of the community policing training would encompass this behavior, for example, officers most likely learned about the benefits of providing information on other agencies that might be able to offer help. It might be that police with more community policing training have not yet internalized the training or that they are unsure of how to use it. Certainly the community policing philosophy is known for not having a clear definition or set of guidelines to follow. We cannot reject the null hypothesis in regard to the other

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

support category, provision of physical assistance, comfort or sympathy as officers with more training in community policing do not significantly vary, on their provision of this behavior, from officers with less training.[76] The analysis of the dichotomous support variable does mask this difference.[77]

Finally, these findings further suggest that police behavior is not patterned to a large extent by officer attitudes (at least not directly). Variation in officers' attitudes about citizens (i.e., cynicism) and aggressiveness do not produce significant variation in the provision of support to juvenile suspects. Unexpectedly, suspects who interact with police officers who identify with a broad role orientation are significantly more likely to be released than to receive helpful information from the police; they are also more likely to be released than they are to receive comfort, sympathy, or physical assistance from police. These relationships are contrary to those hypothesized in Chapter Three.

Officer attitudes about the importance of enforcing the law has some influence on police decisions to provide support, but the direction of the effect is contrary to the hypothesized relationship. Juveniles interacting with police who agree that enforcing the law is their most important responsibility are significantly more likely to receive helpful

[76]However, although juveniles encountering police with more training in community policing are significantly more likely to be released than they are to receive helpful information, they are also significantly more likely to be comforted, receive sympathy, or physical assistance from police (rather than receive helpful information, not released).

[77]The true impact of the police organization is also masked by the analysis of police support as a dichotomy. Treating support as a trichotomy reveals that officers in St. Petersburg significantly vary from officers in Indianapolis only on the first category of support, the offering of helpful information. Unexpectedly, officers in St. Petersburg are less likely to provide suspects with helpful information than they are just to release them. This finding is curious because this department had more fully evolved into a community policing department.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

information rather than to just be released. This is surprising because one might expect that officers who believe that enforcing the law is their most important responsibility might put less emphasis on the use of helpful and supportive tactics. However, there is no evidence of that here, in fact it appears as though police who emphasize their law enforcement responsibility attitudinally, still offer support behaviorally.

As hypothesized, officers who strongly agree about the importance of assisting citizens (compared to those who somewhat agree or disagree) are significantly more likely to offer juvenile suspects comfort, sympathy, or physical assistance rather than just releasing them (they are also significantly more likely to receive comfort and sympathy rather than information to help them with their problem). Juveniles are not more or less likely to receive helpful information from officers who vary in their attitudes about assistance.

In conclusion, it appears that police officers are practicing both a social control and service provider role as they work the street. While they do not provide support and assistance to suspects as often as they impose authority, they do offer support on a fairly frequent basis (to about one quarter of suspects). The social-psychological approach to explaining police support with juvenile suspects suggests that police behavior is influenced by both their own backgrounds and the characteristics of the situation to which they are presented. Police supportive behaviors are patterned more by officer characteristics than police authority - and, to a lesser extent, support is also somewhat patterned by situational factors.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 7-1
Binary Measure of Police Support

Disposition	Frequencies	
	N	%
No Support	499	76.3
Any Support	155	23.7

Table 7-2
Trichotomous Measure of Police Support

Disposition	Overall Frequencies		Scaled Frequencies	
	N	%	N	%
No Support	499	76.3	499	76.3
Providing Information	127	19.4	95	14.5
Physical Assistance Comfort/Sympathy	60	9.2	60	9.2

Table 7-3
Binary Logit Analysis of the Support Dichotomy

	Social Psychological Model	
	Coef.	**(SE)**
Encounter Characteristics		
Seriousness	-.000	(.132)
Victim Requests Arrest	-2.422**	(1.137)
Victims Requests No Arrest	-.062	(.998)
Supervisor Present	-.116	(.543)
# Officers Present	.008	(.068)
# Citizens Present	-.005	(.022)
Social Distress of Neighborhood	.016**	(.007)
Juvenile Characteristics		
Evidence	.932**	(.245)
Minority	-.167	(.260)
Female	.461*	(.274)
Level of Wealth	.187	(.247)
Demeanor	.693**	(.341)
Use of Alcohol or Drugs	.224	(.466)
Organization		
St. Petersburg	-.684**	(.285)
Officer Characteristics		
Minority	.492	(.358)
Female	-.969**	(.385)
Education	.360*	(.193)
Length of Service	.048**	(.023)
Assignment (CP/Run Officer)	-2.673**	(1.071)
CP Training	-.313*	(.179)
Mediation Training	-.070	(.318)
Officer Attitudes		
Cynicism	-.003	(.067)
Aggressiveness	.333	(.259)
Role Conception	-.103**	(.046)
Law Enforcement	.164	(.184)
Assistance	.431	(.321)
Selective/Not Aggressive	.650	(.482)
Constant:	-3.600**	(1.257)
Model Chi square value and (sig)	81.632	(.000)

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 7-4
Logit Analysis of the Support Trichotomy and Comparison with Dichotomy

	Social Psychological Model		*Multinomial Model*			
			Information		*Comfort/Sympathy*	
	Coef.	**(SE)**	**Coef.**	**(SE)**	**Coef.**	**(SE)**
Encounter Characteristics						
Seriousness	-.000	(.132)	-.228	(.173)	.100	(.171)
Victim Requests Arrest	-2.422**	(1.137)				
Victims Requests No Arrest	-.062	(.998)	.851	(1.272)	.632	(1.32)
Supervisor Present	-.116	(.543)	.099	(.695)	.069	(.708)
# Officers Present	.008	(.068)	.014	(.087)	.119	(.083)
# Citizens Present	-.005	(.022)	.006	(.022)	.049	(.039)
Social Distress of Neighborhood	.016**	(.007)	.005	(.009)	.018**	(.009)
Juvenile Characteristics						
Evidence	.932**	(.245)	.715**	(.307)	1.043**	(.340)
Minority	-.167	(.260)	.030	(.334)	-.307	(.359)
Female	.461*	(.274)	.175	(.364)	.911**	(.361)
Level of Wealth	.187	(.247)	.407	(.312)	-.204	(.342)
Demeanor	.693**	(.341)	.864**	(.395)	.625	(.468)
Use Alcohol or Drugs	.224	(.466)	-1.096	(.789)	.478	(.551)
Organization						
St. Petersburg	-.684**	(.285)	-1.275**	(.374)	-.573	(.377)
Officer Characteristics						
Minority	.492	(.358)	.776*	(.461)	-.119	(.480)
Female	-.969**	(.385)	-1.284**	(.508)	-.878*	(.519)
Education	.360*	(.193)	.451*	(.243)	.479*	(.268)
Length of Service	.048**	(.023)	.043	(.028)	.054*	(.032)
Assignment (CP/Run Officer)	-2.673**	(1.071)				
CP Training	-.313*	(.179)	-.751**	(.229)	.026	(.249)
Mediation Training	-.070	(.318)	.091	(.404)	.298	(.421)
Officer Attitudes						
Cynicism	-.003	(.067)	-.034	(.086)	.021	(.094)
Aggressiveness	.333	(.259)	.248	(.314)	.132	(.342)
Role Conception	-.103**	(.046)	-.138**	(.059)	-.112*	(.061)
Law Enforcement	.164	(.184)	.546**	(.249)	.152	(.258)
Assistance	.431	(.321)	-.096	(.373)	.978*	(.494)
Selective/Not Aggressive	.650	(.482)	.749	(.577)	.045	(.691)
Constant:	-3.600**	(1.257)	-3.047**	(1.535)	-5.359**	(1.762)
Model Chi sqre value and (sig.)	81.632	(.000)	99.472	(.000)		

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

CHAPTER EIGHT

POLICING JUVENILES: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

While juveniles who are processed into the system by police officers will have numerous opportunities to be removed from the juvenile justice system (by probation officers, prosecutors, judges, etc.), the police are the social control agents who make the initial decisions about how to handle juvenile suspects. As I have argued, this gatekeeper role is an important one - it is here that juveniles may be formally labeled (correctly or incorrectly) as delinquents and be introduced to the juvenile justice system. While there has recently been a great deal of attention focused on juvenile courts, probation, and corrections, the police role in juvenile justice has not received much consideration. This research has attempted, to an extent, to fill this void. In this final chapter I draw some parallels between what previous researchers have reported and what has been confirmed here. Next, I discuss new insights into policing juveniles, the key findings of my research, the limitations, the theoretical and practical implications, and, finally, some ideas for future research in the area.

Parallels to Previous Research

In many respects, findings reported here confirm what previous studies on police - juvenile interactions have reported (though these parallels can only be drawn with respect to police use of authority). First, police use their authority to formally take juveniles into custody infrequently. Only 13% of suspects were taken into custody for the purpose of charging. This is consistent with arrest rates reported by police scholars twenty and thirty

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

years ago (e.g., Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman et.al., 1978). Second, police officers are more likely to arrest juvenile suspects when the problem is of a more serious nature, and when they have enough evidence that might be considered sufficient for probable cause.

Third, when juvenile suspects are verbally or behaviorally disrespectful toward police, the officer is more likely to make an arrest. This too confirms what previous researchers reported about the influence of juvenile demeanor on police arrest decisions (see Black and Reiss, 1970; Lundman et.al., 1978; Worden and Myers, 1999). However, one should consider that the estimated coefficient is statistically significant with a one tail test (two tail test in the reduced model), and while being disrespectful does increase the probability of arrest, it increases the probability by only a modest amount. Also, as mentioned in Chapter Three, the practical implications of police handling a disrespectful juvenile suspect should be seriously considered. There are a couple of valid arguments to discuss with regard to this issue, two of which I would like to take a moment to briefly address. One argument is that police should not react differently because a juvenile is being disrespectful - that they should not be influenced by a suspect's demeanor, but rather by the legal factors with which they are presented and to whether or not there is some violation taking place. The reasoning behind this line of argument is simple: police should enforce the written law by responding to the legal characteristics of the situation. Further, their academy and on the job training should equip them with tools that make them either unaffected by suspect demeanor and/or that enable them to de-escalate the situation. Some would argue then, that to react to a suspect's demeanor, is unprofessional because discretion should be influenced more by the law than by extralegal factors. Some would contend that another

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

reason for police not to react to disrespect, is that police might actually misinterpret cultural differences/cues as a form of disrespect when in fact the juvenile might not be intentionally acting disrespectfully toward the officer.

The other side of the coin regarding demeanor (the second argument) relates to an officer's perception of whether or not a particular situation is under control. One would expect that police would not leave an encounter where it appeared things continued to be potentially volatile (or even if it were questionable that perhaps things were not under control). Disrespect may in fact be interpreted by police as an indication that something else (out of necessity) ought to be done. If this is the case, then police may actually be considering suspect demeanor as a very important factor in deciding on arrest (and other alternatives). It would be difficult to argue that this constitutes an officer acting in an unprofessional manner without looking at each individual situation.

Fourth, these findings provide additional evidence to the suppositions that police are more likely to arrest juvenile suspects when there is a weapon present at the scene and when the police know the juvenile suspect prior to the current encounter. Previous research has reported similar findings. It seems that with the exception of victim preferences for arrest, the same situational factors, legal and extralegal, influencing police arrest decisions with juvenile suspects twenty and thirty years ago, are still related to police behavior today.

New Insight into Police - Juvenile Interactions

Having noted these parallels between previous studies and this research, this work also provides some additional insight into police - juvenile encounters. First, and perhaps

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

most importantly, these data show that police officers use their professional position to be both an agent of social control and a public service provider for juvenile suspects. These data provide evidence to support arguments made by Cumming, Cumming, and Edell (1965) that police officers (in general, not specifically with respect to juveniles) balance a dual role of both an authoritative agent and a service provider. Cumming et.al. (1965) speculated that police are, by the nature of their job, explicitly concerned with authority and controlling people (and indeed police are expected to use their coercive authority to bring situations and people under control) and are only latently concerned with support. Inasmuch as this is accurate, one might expect police to respond more frequently with authority and less often with support. Findings here do support this expectation. In all, 95% of suspects were subject to at least some form of police authority while, in comparison, about one quarter of suspects were recipients of at least one form of support. This means that juvenile suspects are much more likely to be subject to police authority than they are to receive support. But, in resolving issues with juvenile suspects, police are clearly using their discretion and acting both as a social control agent and as a public service provider (even though both roles are not apparent in each encounter). William Ker Muir (1977) might characterize officers who are better able to balance this dual role as true 'professionals' - those, who he might assert, are best able to integrate proportionate coercion (authority) with a sense of morality and an understanding of human suffering (the need for assistance/help).

Second, these findings tell us that police use a variety of behaviors to solve problems. The findings illustrate that juveniles might be subject to many forms of police authority during the course of an encounter with police. Police issued requests, made suggestions, and

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

lectured 80% of suspects; they investigated 60% and issued commands and threats to 38%. Fifteen percent of juveniles had police tell their parent or guardian about the situation and 3% were actually issued a citation. Table 5-19 from Chapter Five breaks down, in detail, the authoritative responses used by police in these encounters. In sum, police clearly used many forms of authority to handle suspect youth.

In trying to solve problems, police also provided support and assistance to suspects. As Table 5-23 (from Chapter Five) illustrates, police provided some information to help juveniles deal with their problems to 20% of suspects. On their own initiative, police also provided physical assistance, comfort, or sympathy to 9% of suspects.

This in depth look at police behavior indicates that police utilize many tools to effectively do their job. They use their authority in various ways and they provide support on a fairly frequent basis. One might suppose that police use these different tactics as ingredients that are applied and utilized as the situation calls for them - and that there is no single recipe for solving juvenile problems. I would suspect that for police officers the ideal outcome of 'resolving the problem' is the goal in each encounter, but the ingredients utilized to get there vary according to the situation and the responding officer.

Third, the extension of the sociological approach to a social-psychological examination of police behavior with juveniles provides some additional understanding of police use of authority. This approach appears to provide more of an understanding of police provision of support than it does of police authority. Below, I will briefly highlight some of the key findings (from Chapter Six and Seven) with respect to police authority and support.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Key Findings on Police Use of Authority - With respect to arrest, as discussed above, these results confirm some of the findings reported in previous observational studies on policing juveniles: that police are more likely to arrest juvenile suspects when the evidence is strong, the problem is serious, the juvenile is disrespectful, there is a weapon present, or if police have some prior knowledge of the juvenile from a previous interaction. In addition, this research also reveals that police are more likely to make an arrest when a police supervisor is present for part, or all, of an encounter. Contrary to what was hypothesized, and contrary to what previous research reports, police were not, statistically speaking, more likely to arrest juvenile suspects when the complainant requested an arrest. Findings here indicate that police behave no differently in this situation. Also, police discretion to arrest was not influenced by suspect race, sex, or apparent level of wealth.

Police arrest decisions were not patterned by officer characteristics and attitudes. However, some organizational differences do emerge: police in St. Petersburg are statistically less likely to arrest juvenile suspects than Indianapolis police officers. This effect, independent of situational and individual factors, suggests that organizational differences, perhaps department policy or variation in training on how to handle problems with juveniles, have some impact on police behavior.

With regard to the analysis of the nominal measure of police authority, many relationships were revealed that were similar to those seen in the arrest analysis. Police were more likely to investigate, issue commands and threats, and tell juveniles' parents about the problem when the evidence was strong and the problem was of a more serious nature. When

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

a supervisor was present for part of the encounter, police were significantly more likely to arrest the suspect than they were to issue them commands and threats; and this analysis reveals that police are also less likely to investigate than they are to release or advise, issue commands and threats, or arrest suspects, when a police supervisor is at the scene. As discussed in Chapter Six, perhaps police are less likely to perform investigative tactics with supervisors being present because it provides an opportunity for police to make a procedural error or mistake in front of the supervisor.

Some additional effects of situational factors emerged in the nominal analysis. When the complainant is at the scene and is a minority, police are significantly less likely to investigate juvenile suspects, and also less likely to tell their parents about the problem, than they are to release the suspect. In this situation, police are no more or less likely to issue commands and threats or make arrests than they are to release or make requests of suspects. Somewhat related, if the police initiate the encounter with a juvenile themselves, rather then at a citizen's request, police are more likely to issue juveniles commands and threats than any other approach (including arrest and release). Also, when police encountered juvenile suspects in socially distressed neighborhoods they were more likely to issue command and threats than they were to release them, indicating that they use more authority in this environment. However, police were also less likely to arrest and less likely to tell the juvenile's parents about the problem than they were to issue these commands and threats. So, while in one respect police use more authority, the probability of arrest when compared to the probability of being issued commands and threats indicates that police are less likely to arrest when encountering suspects in socially distressed areas. Perhaps police feel issuing

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

commands and threats to juveniles in these neighborhoods is the most effective way to restore order and possibly impact future behavior (police may feel, for example, that making an arrest or telling the suspect's parents or guardian will not do any good).

While situational factors were fairly influential in this analysis (as they were in the arrest analysis) the effects of officer characteristics and attitudes are limited. In the original model, where release was the comparison category, the only officer characteristic having an impact on police authority was the amount of training in community policing; that is, officers with more training in community policing were less likely, than officers with less training, to investigate suspects than they were to release or advise them. When juveniles who were investigated are the comparison group, the effects of four officer characteristics reach a level of statistical significance: officers' education level, assignment (as a community specialist or patrol officer) training in community policing, and training in mediation skills. The influence of officer education and assignment are statistically significant in only one respect - officers with more college education and community policing specialists, are more likely than those officers with less education and regularly assigned patrol officers to investigate suspects than they are to issue them commands and threats. For the most part, officers with more college education behave no differently than those with less formal education, and community officers behave no differently from those officers who are assigned as regular patrol or run officers.

The direction of the effect for the amount of training officers received in community policing is unexpected, as officers who have more training seem to use more authority than those officers with less training. Officers with more training in community policing are

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

significantly more likely than officers with less training to issue commands and threats and inform juveniles' parents of the situation than they are to investigate suspects. This suggests that these officers use more authority, however this might possibly be an indication that these officers are more likely to take these actions because they are actually trying to impact juvenile behavior. It may be, because of their training, that these officers are more inclined to tell parents or issue commands and threats than they are to only investigate, because they believe this might make a difference in the juvenile's involvement in trouble-making in the future. Also, as discussed in Chapter Seven, officers with any amount of training in mediation skills are significantly more likely than officers with no such training to investigate juvenile suspects than they are to issue them commands and threats, tell their parents, or make an arrest.

Finally, police authority is not patterned to a large extent by officer attitudes. Only two officer attitudes (cynicism and role conception) reach statistical significance in the nominal models, and none of the attitudes reach significance in the model of arrest. It seems that police authority is patterned mostly by the situation or perhaps it is patterned by factors not included in this study. The theoretical and practical implications of these findings are discussed below.

Key Findings on Police Provision of Support - With regard to police provision of support, several situational factors have a statistically significant effect - but many of the relationships are unexpected. Two significant predictors of police authority, evidence strength and juvenile demeanor, have unexpected effects on police provision of support. Juveniles who have more evidence against them, and those who are disrespectful toward

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

police, are more likely to receive support and assistance. One might suppose that juveniles who have more evidence against them might be perceived as being in more need of police assistance and support and perhaps that is why they are more likely to receive it. The relationship between demeanor and police support is perplexing but I believe the multinomial model explains the relationship best: police are more likely to provide information to disrespectful suspects, but they are not more likely to comfort them or act sympathetic to their situation.

As mentioned in Chapter Seven, one of the most interesting findings here is that police provision of support is patterned by different factors than police use of authority. While police authority is patterned, to a large extent, by situational factors and to only a limited extent individual factors, police provision of support is patterned more by individual factors, and to a lesser extent, situational factors. Many of the statistically significant effects are contrary to the hypothesized relationships.

Unlike police use of authority, variation in the makeup of officers does relate to differences in police provision of support. When one considers the changes in the make-up of police departments in terms of officers' race, sex, education level, and training in community policing and related topics, one might expect to see some variation in police behavior as officers differ in these ways. Indeed, there is evidence here to support general propositions about police characteristics influencing police provision of support. As expected, non-white officers are more likely to offer support to suspects than white officers, officers with higher levels of formal education (i.e., college) are more likely to offer support than officers with less education, and officers with more years on the job are more likely to

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

offer support than officers with less experience being a police officer. These findings are consistent with theoretical expectations (presented in Chapter Three) that minority officers, those officers with more formal education, and those with more on the job experience have a better understanding of the importance of their role as a service provider and as a result show more behavioral manifestations of this part of their role.

However, there are some unexpected influences here as well. Female officers, those with more training in community policing, and community policing specialists are less likely, statistically speaking, to provide support to suspects than their counterparts (i.e., male officers, those with less training in community policing, run or patrol officers). This might be a concern for police administrators. Perhaps female officers, either because of their historical exclusion from the police profession or because of their desire to not be typecast as a typical nurturing 'female cop', are less willing to balance a dual role of authority and support. Female officers may strongly reject the expectation that they will be soft on the job and consequently, instead of being a more well rounded officer, as theorized, they may identify (more so than expected) with their role as a social control agent, and less so as a service provider.

In addition, it was expected that police officers who are either community policing specialists or who have more community policing training would be more likely to offer suspects support and assistance than regular patrol officers and those with less or no training in community policing. It is peculiar that these officers are statistically less likely than their counterparts to use their discretion in this manner. It is difficult to fully understand these findings without knowing the specifics of the training community officers receive, and the

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

training some patrol officers receive on community policing principles. However, even with a more aggressive style of community policing (as we know existed in Indianapolis), one would still expect that these officers would be trained on the use of support and assistance tactics as well as their role as a service provider. That community officers, and those with more training on community policing concepts and principles, are less likely to provide support to juveniles does raise some questions for police administrators about what it really means to be a community officer in their department, as well as the effects of community policing training on police behavior.

Fourth, there is evidence here to support hypotheses about possible organizational influences on police behavior. Officers in Indianapolis and St. Petersburg clearly varied in their use of authority and provision of support. SPPD officers were, as expected, less likely to arrest suspects than IPD officers, and, unexpectedly, SPPD officers were less likely to provide support to juveniles than IPD officers. This is surprising given the fact that the SPPD was trying to implement a softer community policing philosophy than the IPD. Again, this might pique the curiosity of police administrators and prompt them to more fully consider their community policing philosophy, and how that philosophy is internalized by officers and applied practically on the street.

Limitations

While this study deepens our understanding of police - juvenile encounters in many ways, there are some limitations to this research that I would like to address. First, as is the case with most research that utilizes secondary data analysis, these data were not collected

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

with the intention of answering the research questions that were put forth in this project. The POPN study was intended to take a broad look at police-citizen interactions under the rubric of community policing - it was not intended to study police encounters with juveniles. This especially has consequences for the attitudinal measures. Police were asked about their attitudes generally and it is not known if they were instead to be asked to think about interacting with juveniles, and not citizens generally, their responses to these questions would have been different.

Second, because of the complex model of police behavior being tested, it would have been better to have a larger N size. With so many coefficients being estimated on such a small number of cases, it might be that some of the factors that would have achieved statistical significance did not reach that level because of the number of cases.

Third, because of the nature of this research, there is always a chance for officer reactivity to occur. That is, police officers may not behave the same way when a project observer is with them as they would if they were working alone. Overall, it seems police adapt fairly quickly to the presence of having observers accompany them on their shifts. To try and account for officer reactivity, the project was introduced to departments very early (months before the observation period began) and, in addition, the first two weeks of data collection were essentially discarded - so that officers had time to adjust to observer presence. In addition, some observers had occasion to witness police misconduct - something one would not expect if reactivity were a true problem.

Fourth, this kind of study requires that the observers make judgments about what they witness in the field. There is no doubt that when two people witness the same incident they

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

may walk away with different perspectives of what occurred. Observers were trained for four months on how to interpret cues in the field and code, systematically, what they witness while on ride-alongs with patrol officers. It is virtually impossible to know if observers witness and code things in the same way, and I would expect that there is variation to some degree. However the intense training period for observers should have minimized the need for subjective judgment and alleviated any serious threats to the reliability and validity of the data collection method.

Finally, generalizing these findings to other police departments must be done with caution. The findings suggest that police behavior varies somewhat between the two departments studied for this research. Police in St. Petersburg behaved differently, in terms of using authority and support with juvenile suspects, than police in Indianapolis. One might expect that such organizational differences might continue to emerge as additional departments were studied. These two departments were entrenched in the community policing philosophy (though their approach differed) and they served fairly diverse populations. Results might be different for departments that take on different policing strategies or that are located in more rural areas or in large, more urbanized, cities like New York City or Chicago. Additional research, similar in nature to this study, would certainly enhance our understanding of police use of authority and their provision of support to suspect youth, and how these behaviors are patterned by the situation, the officers, and the organization.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Previous research on police - juvenile encounters has taken a sociological approach to explaining police outcomes (usually operationalized as arrest) and has produced some evidence about how the situation influenced these outcomes. While situational approaches to explaining police use of authority with juvenile suspects has demonstrated how some characteristics of the situation to which police are presented impact police behavior - these findings are not determinative. That is to say, while this theoretical approach explains some variation in police use of authority, it does not explain all of the variation.

My research expands from this foundation by taking a social-psychological approach to explaining police behavior with juvenile suspects. Theoretically speaking, my research explores the influence of both situational factors (as previous researchers have done) and officer characteristics and attitudes on police decision-making with juvenile suspects. This theoretical perspective synthesizes sociological and psychological theories of police behavior into one, as a social-psychological theory. My research expands on previous research not only by taking this approach, but also by examining two dimensions of police behavior: police authority and support. In testing propositions from the social-psychological approach (those which were presented in Chapter Three), we reach a better understanding of the factors that do, and do not, influence police discretion with juvenile suspects.

With respect to police use of authority, this research confirms much of what previous researchers have noted about police use of authority with juveniles: this behavior is patterned to a large extent by the characteristics of the situation. Specifically, the seriousness of the problem, evidence strength, presence of a weapon, prior knowledge of a suspect, and suspect demeanor are found, statistically speaking, to influence police authority. In addition, the

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

presence of a supervisor and the race of the complainant are found to have some impact as well. The effects of officer characteristics and attitudes on police authority are limited. It seems that variation if officer characteristics and attitudes, as they are measured here, do not consistently pattern police use of authority. This finding holds true for not only police arrest decisions, but also less authoritative (and less formal) outcomes where one might expect officer discretion to be patterned more by their own sense of what ought to be done (and thus be more of a reflection of their backgrounds and attitudes). The only characteristics influencing police authority, statistically speaking, include police training in community policing and mediation skills, college education, and assignment (community officers vs. patrol officer) - these factors are significant only to a limited extent, and this suggests that officer characteristics improve explanations of police behavior with juveniles only modestly.

The same is true for officer attitudes - few of the coefficients reach statistical significance indicating that behavior is not patterned much by these attitudes. However two officer attitudes are found to significantly affect police use of authority: officers with broad views of their role and officers who are cynical about citizens willingness to help them, use their authority with juveniles in significantly different ways than their counterparts. This suggests that perhaps officer behavior is patterned to some extent by their attitudes but the model may need to be better specified or the attitudinal measures may need to be re-considered.

With respect to police provision of support, like the model of police authority, situational factors shape police provision of support to juveniles in several ways suggesting that, theoretically and practically speaking, police are influenced by the situation to which

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

they are presented. As expected, police are less likely to offer juveniles support when the victim is lobbying for an arrest. Also as expected, female suspects are more likely to receive support than male suspects, and the multinomial model indicates that this difference is mostly with respect to receiving comfort and sympathy from officers, as females are significantly more likely to be comforted or to have police be sympathetic to their problems. Male and female juveniles are equally likely to receive helpful information from police. Unexpectedly, officers were more likely to provide support to juveniles who had more evidence against them and to those who were disrespectful. Police were also more likely to provide support to juveniles who were encountered in more socially distressed neighborhoods (police were especially more likely to comfort these juveniles) indicating that perhaps police saw a greater need to behave this way in these highly distressed areas.

Theoretically, support was found for several of the hypotheses about the influence of officer characteristics on police provision of support. Hypotheses about the influence of officer race, education level, and length of service were confirmed, at least to some extent, in this study. Other officer characteristics had a significant effect on police use of support and assistance (officer sex, assignment, and training) but the direction of the effect was unanticipated. The same was true for the influence of officer attitudes. Three officer attitudes had a significant effect on police provision of support to juveniles, but the direction of the effects for two attitudes (perception of role and law enforcement) were contrary to the hypothesized relationship. This could have practical implications for police administrators, or it could mean that the attitudinal measures need to be reconsidered.

Practically, this research informs police administrators and policymakers about how

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

the police come to interact with juvenile suspects, the types of problems in which juveniles are involved, and how police are likely to resolve these problems. Inasmuch as police use of authority and provision of support are analogous to outcomes, this research also informs us on how the outcomes of police-juveniles interactions are shaped by the situation and the officers themselves.

In the two police departments selected for the POPN study, both were implementing a community policing philosophy in their department. SPPD had been further along in the process, and they had undertaken a different type of community policing approach than the IPD. For SPPD, community policing was softer than it was for the IPD, they put heavy emphasis on community outreach and building partnerships with the community. While IPD did some of this as well, they were more interested in a hard-nosed approach that resembled more of an aggressive, broken windows, style of policing. Given this information (and this is limited information about the departments' philosophy) one would still expect officers in these departments to have a good grasp of the importance of utilizing alternatives to arrest with juveniles to try and impact their behavior (now and in the future). There is evidence here that supports this expectation. One would also expect officers to have some understanding of the importance of not only their authoritative, social control role, but their supportive, service, role as well. There is some indication of this here as well. Officers balance their use of authority and support when encountering juveniles. Juveniles are more likely to be recipients of police authority than they are support, but it is clear that officers utilize both types of behavior to solve problems. Police administrators might be interested to know that police are both authoritative and supportive when they encounter juveniles and

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

perhaps they may want to consider better training officers on how, when handling suspect youth, to better integrate these two roles.

Further, administrators and policymakers might be especially interested in knowing how diversifying the make-up of police personnel has influenced police behavior on the street. The hiring of more female, minority, and college educated officers, along with the expected impact of departmental training in community policing and other topics, were expected to influence police behavior with juveniles. While we do not have any baseline data for comparison purposes, it was expected that there would be significant differences in how, for example, female officers use their authority and provide support compared to male officers. Overall, there are not many significant differences in police behavior due to officer characteristics and attitudes, but some differences have emerged. For example, as mentioned above, female officers are less likely than male officers to offer support to suspects. Female officers might be rejecting the expectation that they will be soft on the job and, as a result, instead of being an officer who is more accepting of the supportive police role, as expected, they may instead identify (more so than expected) with their role as a social control agent. I would think a comfort and sympathy. This finding leads one to ask how training in community policing concepts translates to behavior on the street. The fact that these officers do not vary much in their use of authority with juveniles might be of interest as well, it was expected that officers with more training would use less authority and be less likely to make arrests than officer with little or no training - but for the most part these officers behave very similarly.

Police are a source of both social control and support for juvenile suspects. Police scholars are fairly comfortable theorizing about police discretion, though discretion has

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

typically been operationalized in terms of police authority (particularly the police arrest decision). But theoretical approaches to explaining other behavioral dimensions such as support, may need to be better specified. If the police role is explicitly concerned with police authority and only latently with support, we might expect that the provision of support would be patterned more by officer characteristics and attitudes than authority - inasmuch as the outcomes associated with support might be better explained by officers' own sense of what needs to be done to solve problems. This research provides some evidence for this general hypothesis. Police support is patterned more by officers' backgrounds than police authority - though some situational factors do significantly affect police provision of support as well.

Other theoretical initiatives that further explore the organizational influences on police behavior with juveniles might prove to be fruitful lines of inquiry. There is evidence here that police organizations and department policy (i.e., training) influence the way officers solve problems with suspect youth.

Future Research

This research expands our understanding of police juvenile encounters in many ways. With current data, it provides insight into how contemporary police come to interact with juveniles, the problems in which juveniles are involved, how police use their position to solve these problems, and how police outcomes are shaped by the situation, the officers, and to some extent the police organization. In the future, this research can be expanded upon by conducting studies that are similar in nature, but that study police behavior with juveniles in both rural and more urbanized areas. This would allow for a deeper understanding of organizational differences and influences on behavior, as well as the impact of departmental

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

policies and training.

In addition, while understanding how police use their discretion to both benefit and sanction juveniles is important (Lipsky, 1980), perhaps the next big step would include a study of how police outcomes with suspect youth actually influence juvenile behavior (future delinquency). That is to say, one would study the effects of police decisions and the impact that police authority and support imposed on suspects might have on future juvenile offending. A study of this nature would be large scale, but if policymakers and police administrators really want to know what works with juvenile suspects, then this type of research must be undertaken.

Finally, our understanding of police use of discretion with juvenile suspects would be further enhanced by studying the decisions made by juvenile unit detectives. Most police departments around the country have either specialized juvenile units or, at least, juvenile detectives. While patrol officers make the majority of the decisions about who gets processed into the system, many times the next stop in the juvenile justice system is the juvenile unit, or a juvenile detective. In order to more fully understand the police role in processing youth, one needs to understand the decisions of these detectives as well - how they make decisions, and specifically the factors on which their decisions are based.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Works Cited

Aldrich, John H. and Forrest Nelson (1984). Linear Probability, Logit, and Probit Models. Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. Newbury, California: Sage Publications.

Bayley, David (1986). "The Tactical Choices of Patrol Officers," Journal of Criminal Justice. Volume: 14.

Bayley, David H. and Harold Mendelsohn (1969). Minorities and the Police: Confrontation in America. The Free Press, New York.

Berk, Sarah Fenstermaker, and Donileen R. Loseke (1980-81). "Handling' Family Violence: Situational Determinants of Police Arrest in Domestic Disturbances," Law & Society Review. 15 (19

Bittner, Egon (1974). "Florence Nightingale in Pursuit of Willie Sutton: A Theory of the Police." in Herbert Jacob (ed.), The Potential for Reform of Criminal Justice. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Black, Donald, 1971. "The Social Organization of Arrest," Stanford Law Review Vol. 23: 1087-1111.

Black, Donald (1976). The Behavior of Law. Academic Press, Inc. California.

Black, Donald (1980). "Dispute Settlement by the Police," in The Manners and Customs of the Police. New York: Academic Press.

Black, Donald and Albert J. Reiss (1967). Studies in Crime and Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas. Report submitted to The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

Black, Donald and Albert J. Reiss (1970). "Police Control of Juveniles," American Sociological Review. Vol 35: 63.

Bloch, Peter B. and Deborah Anderson (1974). Police Women on Patrol. The Police Foundation, Washington, DC.

Broderick, John J. (1987). Police in a Time of Change. Waveland Press, Inc. Prospect Heights, Illinois.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Brown, Michael K (1988). Working the Street: Police Discretion and Dilemmas of Reform. Russel Sage Foundation, New York.

Buerger, Michael and Lorraine Green Mazerolle (1998). "Third Party Policing: A Theoretical Analysis of an Emerging Trend," Justice Quarterly. Vol 15 (2): 301.

Cumming, Elaine and Ian Cumming and Laura Edell (1965). "Policeman as Philosopher, Guide and Friend," Social Problems. Vol. 12.

Feld, Barry C. (1997). "Abolish the Juvenile Court: Youthfulness, Criminal Responsibility, and Sentencing Policy," The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. Vol. 88: 68 - 137.

Florida Statutes: Title XLVII, Chapter 985 on "Delinquency; Interstate Compact on Juveniles".

Frank, James and Steven Brandl (1991). "The Police Attitude-Behavior Relationship: Methodological and Conceptual Considerations," American Journal of Police, Vol. 10: 83.

Friedrich, Robert J. (1982) "Police use of Force: Individuals, Situations, and Organizations,"

Fyfe, James J. (1981). "Who Shoots? A Look at Officer Race and Police Shooting," Journal of Police Science and Administration. Vol. 9: 367-382.

Fyfe, James J (1988). "Police Use of Deadly Force: Research and Reform," Justice Quarterly Vol. 5: 165-205.

Gibson, James L. (1978). "Judges' Role Orientations, Attitudes, and Decisions: An Interactive Model," The American Political Science Review. Vol. 72, pp. 911-924.

Gilligan, Carol (1982). In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.

Goldstein, Herman (1987). "Toward Community Oriented Policing: Potential, Basic Requirements and Threshold Questions," Crime and Delinquency Vol. 33: 6-33.

Goldstein, Herman (1990). Problem Oriented Policing. McGraw Hill, Inc.

Greene, jack R. and Carl B. Klockars (1991). "What Police Do," In Klockars, C.B. and Mastrofski, S.D. (Eds.), Thinking about Police. McGraw Hill, Inc.

Grennan, Sean A. (1987). "Findings on the Role of Officer Gender in Violent Encounters with Citizens," Journal of Police Science and Administration. Vol. 15: 78-85.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Guyot, Dorothy (1991). Policing as though People Matter. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hildebrand, David, James D. Lang, and Howard Rosenthal (1977). Analysis of Ordinal Data. Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. Newbury, California: Sage Publications.

Hohenstein, William (1969). "Factors Influencing the Police Disposition of Juvenile Offenders," in Thorstein Selling and Marvin Wolfgang (ed) Delinquency: Selected Studies. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Homant, Robert and Daniel Kennedy (1985). "Police Perceptions of Spouse Abuse: A Comparison of Male and Female Officers," Journal of Criminal Justice, vol. 13, pp. 29-47.

Indiana Codes: Article 30 "Juvenile Law: Juvenile Court Jurisdiction", Sections 1-11.

Kelling, George (1985). "Order Maintenance, the Quality of Urban Life, and Police: A Line of Argument," in William Geller (ed.) Police Leadership in America: Crisis and Opportunity. New York: Preager, pp296-308.

Klinger, David A. (1996). "Quantifying Law in Police-Citizen Encounters," Journal of Quantitative Criminology. Vol. 12 (4).

Klinger, David A.(1997). "Negotiating Order in Patrol Work: An Ecological Theory of Police Response to Deviance," Criminology. Vol. 35: 277.

Lipsky, Michael (1980). Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Long, Scott J. (1997). Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables. London: Sage Publications.

Lundman, Richard; Sykes, Richard and John P Clark (1978). "Police Control of Juveniles," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. January: p. 74.

Lurigio, Arthur J., and Loretta J. Stalans (1990). "Thinking More about How Criminal Justice Decision Makers Think," Criminal Justice and Behavior. Vol. 17: 260.

Maguire, Kathleen and Ann L. Pastore (eds.), Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics (1997). US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington D.C.: USGPO, 1998.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Manning, Peter K. (1978). "The Police: Mandate, Strategies, and Appearances," in Peter K. Manning and John Van Maanen (eds.) Policing: A View from the Street. New York: Random House.

Martin, Susan Ehrlich (1980). Breaking and Entering: Policewomen on Patrol. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Martin, Susan E. (1990). On The Move: The Status of Women in Policing. The Police Foundation.

Mastrofski, Stephen, and Roger B. Parks, 1990. "Improving Observational Studies of Police," Criminology Vol. 28: 475-496.

Mastrofski, Stephen; Ritti, Richard; and Debra Hofffmaster, (1987) "Organizational Determinants of Police Discretion: The case of Drinking and Driving," Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol. 15.

Mastrofski, Stephen D., Robert E. Worden, and Jeffrey B. Snipes, 1995. "Law Enforcement in a Time of Community Policing," Criminology. Vol.33: (November): 539-563.

McEachern and Bauzer (1967). "Factors Related to Disposition in Juvenile Police Contacts," in Klein and Myerhoff (eds.) Juvenile Gangs in Context. NJ: Prentice Hall.

McIver, John and Roger B. Parks (1983). "Evaluating Police Performance: Identification of Effective and Ineffective Police Actions," in William Geller and Hans Toch (eds.), Police Violence. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

McNamara, John H. (1967). "Uncertainties in Police Work: The Relevance of Police Recruits' Background and Training," in Bordura, David J. (ed.), The Police: Six Sociological Essays. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Meyers, Allan R., Heeren, Timothy, and Ralph Harrington (1989). "Discretionary Leniency In Police Enforcement of Law Against Drinking and Driving: Two Examples From the State of Maine, USA," Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol. 17, pp. 179-186.

Morash-Merry and Jack R. Greene (1986). "Evaluating Women on Patrol: a Critique of Contemporary Wisdom," Evaluation Review. Vol. 10: 230.

Muir, William Ker Jr. (1977). Police: Street Corner Politicians. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Niederhoffer, Arthur (1969). Behind the Shield: The Police in Urban Society (Chapter: 4).

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

New York: Anchor Books.

Paoline, Eugene A. III, Stephanie M. Myers, and Robert E. Worden (2000) "Police Culture, Individualism, and Community Policing: Evidence from Two Police Departments," Justice Quarterly, Forthcoming.

Piliavin, Irving and Scott Briar (1964). "Police Encounters with Juveniles," American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 70: 206.

Scott, Elizabeth and Thomas Grisso (1997). "The Evolution of Adolescence: A Developmental Perspective on Juvenile Justice," The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. Vol. 88: 138-189.

Sealock, Miriam D., and Sally S. Simpson, 1998. "Unraveling Bias in Arrest Decisions: The Role of Juvenile Offender Type-Scripts," Justice Quarterly Vol.15: 427-457.

Sherman, Lewis J. (1975). "An Evaluation of Policewomen On Patrol In A Suburban Police Department," Journal of Police Science and Administration. Vol. 3: 434-438.

Smith, Douglas A., 1984. "The Organizational Context of Legal Control," Criminology. Vol. 22: 19-38.

Smith, Douglas (1987). "Police Response to Interpersonal Violence: Defining the parameters of legal control," Social Forces. Vol. 65: 767-82.

_____, and Jody R. Klein (1983). "Police Agency Characteristics and Arrest Decisions," InWhitaker, G.P., and Phillips, C.D. (Eds.), Evaluating Performance of Criminal Justice Agencies. Sage Publications.

Smith, Douglas and Christy Visher (1981). "Street Level Justice: Situational Determinants of Police Arrest Decisions," Social Problems. Vol. 29.

_____, and Laura A. Davidson, 1984. "Equity and Discretionary Justice: The Influence of Race on Police Arrest Decisions," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. Vol. 75: 234-249.

Snortum, John R. and John C. Beyers (1983). "Patrol Activities of Male and Female Officers as a Function of Work Experience," Police Studies. Vol. 6: 36-42.

Stalans, Loretta J., and Arthur J. Lurigio (1990). "Lay and Professionals' Beliefs about Crime and Criminal Sentencing: A Need For Theory, Perhaps Schema Theory," Criminal Justice and Behavior. Vol. 17: 333.

Stalans, Loretta J., and Mary A. Finn (1995). "How Novice and Experienced Officers

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Interpret Wife Assaults: Normative and Efficiency Frames," Law & Society Review. Vol. 29: 287-321.

Sykes, Richard E. and Edward E. Brent (1980). "The Regulation of Interaction by Police: A Systems View of Taking Charge," Criminology. Vol. 18: 182 - 197.

Sykes, Richard E. and Edward E. Brent (1983). Policing: A Social Behaviorist Perspective. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Terry, Robert (1967). "The Screening of Juvenile Offenders," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science. Vol. 58 (2): 173.

Walker, Samuel (1992). The Police in America (2nd edition). McGraw Hill, Inc. New York.

Whitaker, Gordon P. (1982). "What is Patrol Work?" Police Studies. 4: 13-22.

White, Susan (1972). "A Perspective of Police Professionalization," Law and Society Review. Vol. 7.

Wilson, James, Q. (1968). Varieties of Police Behavior. Harvard University Press: Cambridge Massachusets.

Wilson, James Q., and George L. Kelling. "Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety," The Atlantic Monthly (1982): 29-38.

Worden, Alissa P. (1993). "The Attitudes of Women and Men in Policing: Testing Conventional and Contemporary Wisdom," Criminology. Vol. 31: 203-237.

Worden, Robert E. (1989)."Situational and Attitudinal Explanations of Police Behavior: A Theoretical Reappraisal and Empirical Assessment," Law & Society Review . Vol. 23: 667-711.

Worden, Robert E. (1992). "The Causes of Police Brutality: Theory and Evidence on the Use of Force," Police Violence. Edited by Geller and Toch.

Worden, Robert and Steven Brandl (1990). "Protocol Analysis of Police Decision making: Toward a Theory of Police Behavior," American Journal of Criminal Justice 14: 297-318.

Worden, Robert E. and Stephanie M. Myers (1999) "Police Encounters with Juvenile Suspects," Report to the National Research Council's Panel on Juvenile Crime: Prevention, Treatment and Control. This report has also been submitted to the National Institute of

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Justice (pursuant to Grant 95-IJ-CX-0071).

Worden, Robert E. and Alissa A. Pollitz (1984). "Police Arrests in Domestic Disturbances: A Further Look," Law and Society Review. Vol. 18 (1).

Worden, Robert E., and Robin L. Shepard, 1996. "Demeanor, Crime, and Police Behavior: A Reexamination of Police Services Study Data," Criminology Vol. 34: 83-105.

Wordes, Madeline, and Timothy S. Bynum, 1995. "Policing Juveniles: Is There Bias Against Youths of Color?" in Kimberly Kempf Leonard, Carl E. Pope, and William H. Feyerherm, eds., Minorities in Juvenile Justice. Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage.

Wordes, Madeline, Timothy S. Bynum and Charles J. Corley (1994). "Locking Up Youth: The Impact of Race on Detention Decisions," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. Vol. 31: 149.

Wyer, R.S. (1980). "The Acquisition and Use of Social Knowledge: Basic Postulates and Representative Research," Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. Vol. 6: 558-573.

_____, and S.E. Gordon (1984). "The Cognitive Representation of Social Information," In Wyer, R.S. and Srull, T.K. (Eds.), Handbook of Social Cognition. Vol. 2. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX A

1. Police Use of Authority[78]

A. Inquiring into the nature of the problem (Narratives: If the narrative indicates that the observed officer (O1) arrived at the scene and inquired about the nature/extent of the problem. For example, " O1 asked C1 (citizen 1) what the problem was".)
B. Listening to one or more sides of the problem (Narratives: If the narratives indicate that O1 listened to a citizen while he/she explained their side of the situation.)
C. Suggesting or requesting that someone do something, proposing a solution (Coding: Observers systematically coded (for each citizen) whether or not the police requested or suggested that the citizen leave the area , cease disorderly behavior, discontinue illegal behavior).
D. Persuading someone to do something (Coding: (same categories as above) Observers systematically coded (for each citizen) whether or not the police tried to persuade a citizen about the same categories as above.
E. Lecturing (Narratives: If the narrative indicates that O1 took the time to talk with the citizen about the consequences of his/her actions - not threatening them, but in more of a teaching style.)
F. Stopping someone from telling their side of the story (Narratives: If the narrative indicates that O1 told the citizen that he did not want to listen to their side. For example, "O1 told C1 that he had heard enough, and to be quiet".)
G. Investigating – searches/interrogation (Coding: Observers systematically coded (for each citizen O1 interacted with) whether or not O1 had interrogated the citizen, had conducted a search of the citizen or the area around the citizen/auto/home.
H. Handcuffing w/out arresting (Narratives/Coding: Observers systematically coded whether or not O1 handcuffed citizens)
I. Commanding, imposing a solution (Coding: Observers systematically coded (for each citizen) whether or not the police commanded that the citizen: leave the area or stop bothering someone; cease disorderly behavior; discontinue illegal behavior).
J. Threatening, imposing a solution (Coding: Observers systematically coded (for each citizen) whether or not the police explicitly threatened that a citizen: leave the area or stop bothering someone; cease disorderly behavior; discontinue illegal behavior. Also, observers coded whether or not O1 threatened arrest or threatened to issue a citation.)
K. Taking a report (Narratives: If the narrative indicates that O1 took a report on the situation.)
L. Declining or refusing to take a report after a citizen requests that one be filed (Coding: Observers coded whether or not each citizen asked police to file a report, and whether or not the police complied with the request (if there was one).)
M. Issuing a citation (Coding: Observers coded whether or not O1 issued a citation).
N. Telling a parent or guardian (Narrative: indicates that the officer mobilized a parent or guardian to inform them of the problem or as a way to handle the encounter.)
O. Arrest (Coding: Observers coded whether or not the citizen was arrested).

[78] The use of physical force is left out of this measure for a couple of reasons. First, it is believed that the use of physical force by the police might be most appropriately examined as a separate dimension of police behavior - and studies on the use of force suggest that it is a rare occurrence. Second, one might suppose that the factors affecting police use of *physical* force (while it is a form of authority) might be at least partly different from the those factors affecting police use of authority in a more general sense.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX A (Continued)

2. Police Provision of Support/Assistance

A. Offering comfort or reassurance (Coding: Observers systematically coded, for each citizen, whether or not O1 comforted or reassured them.)
B. Providing helpful information on their own initiative (Coding: Observers coded whether or not a citizen asked for information about how to deal with their problem (and how the police responded, did they comply, partially comply in their presence), and they also coded if the police provided information about how to deal with a problem on their own initiative.
C. Providing medical or physical assistance on their own initiative (Coding: Observers coded if the police offered physical or medical assistance on their own initiative, and if a citizen asked for this assistance - did the officer partially/fully comply).
D. Being Sympathetic to the Situation (Narratives: If the narratives indicate that O1 said he understood the situation and was sympathetic to it - that he wished he could do something, for example.)

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX B: Officer Survey

First we'd like to ask you about one of the beats that you've worked in. Here is a map of the district. We've shaded the beats that are part of our study.

1. ____ Currently, to what beat or zone are you normally assigned?
[Fill in 2-digit beat number. E.g., A41 is coded as 41; D40 as 40]

3. ____ Going back over the last six months, roughly what proportion of your shift assignments have been to this beat?

[1] all or nearly all
[2] about three fourths
[3] about half
[4] about one fourth
[5] very few or none

[If R is currently assigned to a Study Beat, Go to Q-8]

4. ____ Have you been assigned to any of the shaded beats over the past six months?

[1] No [2] Yes

[If No Then Say: Then let's focus on the beat that you're normally assigned
and Go to Q-8]

5. ____ To which of the shaded beats have you been assigned the most often?
[Fill in 2-digit beat number.]

7. ____ Going back over the last six months, roughly what proportion of your shift assignments have been to this beat?

[1] all or nearly all
[2] about three fourths
[3] about half
[4] about one fourth
[5] very few or none

[If R Says One Fourth or More, Then Say:
Then let's focus on this beat, [beat # for Q-5]

[If R Says Very Few, Then Say:
Then let's focus on the beat that you're normally assigned.]

8. ____ Currently, what would you say is the most important problem in [beat #]?

_____

[Write Respondent's Answer on the Lines above and Also Enter Appropriate 3-digit Problem Code in the Space next to Q-8.]

[HAND LIST A TO R.]

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Here are some conditions that might be problems in some neighborhoods. For each one, please check whether YOU think that it has been a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem in [beat #] over the past 6 months.

[Enter Responses below from the List Completed by R.]

[1] major problem [2] minor problem [3] not a problem

11. ____Theft or burglary

12. ____Litter and trash

13. ____Vandalism of cars & property

14. ____Drug dealing

15. ____Gangs

16. ____Loitering

17. ____Abandoned buildings

I have a few more questions about [beat #].

18. ___ Would you say that in [beat #], it is better for a patrol officer to have ...

[1] a reputation for being hard-nosed [OR]
[2] a reputation for being approachable
[Don't Read]
[3] can't say one or the other

[HAND LIST B OF RESPONSE CATEGORIES TO R.]

Here are the possible responses for the next few questions.

19. ___ How many of the citizens in [beat #] would call the police if they saw something suspicious? [PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it is ...]
[1] most [2] some [3] few [4] none

20. ___ How many of the citizens in [beat #] would provide information about a crime if they knew something and were asked about it by police?
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it is ...]
[1] most [2] some [3] few [4] none

21. ___ How many of the citizens in [beat #] are afraid to cooperate with the police because of what other citizens might do to them?
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it is ...]

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

[1] most [2] some [3] few [4] none

22. ___ How many of the citizens in [beat #] are willing to work with the police to try to solve neighborhood problems?
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it is ...]
[1] most [2] some [3] few [4] none

23. ___ In most beats there are people who repeatedly cause trouble or make work for the police. How many of these people in [beat #] could you identify by name if you saw them on the street?
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it is ...]
[1] most [2] some [3] few [4] none

[HAND LIST C TO R.]

Here's a list of some ways to get information about public safety problems. For each one, please circle the number that best indicates how frequently you find out about problems in [beat #] in each of these ways.

[Enter Responses below from the List Completed by R.]

[1] often [2] sometimes [3] rarely [4] never

24. ____ from your supervisor

25. ____ by talking with citizens who live and work there

26. ____ by talking with other officers

27. ____ by looking at statistics on crime and calls for service

28. ____ by attending meetings of community groups

Now we have some questions about the training that you have received from IPD.

[HAND LIST D TO R.]

Here are some topics on which police sometimes receive training. The topics are general. IPD may have trained on some topics and not others. For each one, please circle the number that best indicates the amount of training you have received in the last THREE years. Then circle the number that best indicates how knowledgeable you feel in that general area.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

[After the Interview, Enter below the Codes from the Table Completed by R. - Use the following codes]

AMOUNT [1] none [2] less than 1 day [3] 1-2 days [4] 3-5 days [5] more than 5 days

KNOWLEDGE [1] Very [2] Fairly [3] Not very knowledgeable

Search and seizure laws and tactics

29. ____ AMOUNT

30. ____ KNOWLEDGE

Public speaking

31. ____ AMOUNT

32. ____ KNOWLEDGE

Using computers and automated information systems

33. ____ AMOUNT

34. ____ KNOWLEDGE

Handling evidence at crime scenes

35. ____ AMOUNT

36. ____ KNOWLEDGE

Concepts and principles of community policing

37. ____ AMOUNT

38. ____ KNOWLEDGE

Code enforcement and use of civil regulations

39. ____ AMOUNT

40. ____ KNOWLEDGE

Mediation

41. ____ AMOUNT

42. ____ KNOWLEDGE

Using crime data to analyze neighborhood problems

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

43. ____ AMOUNT

44. ____ KNOWLEDGE

Organizing community groups

45. ____ AMOUNT

46. ____ KNOWLEDGE

Handling domestic violence incidents

47. ____ AMOUNT

48. ____ KNOWLEDGE

[HAND LIST E TO R.]

Here are some statements about police work generally. For each one, please circle the number that best indicates your opinion.

[Enter Responses below from the List Completed by R.]

[1] agree strongly *[3] disagree somewhat*
[2] agree somewhat *[4] disagree strongly*

49. ____Enforcing the law is by far a patrol officer's most important responsibility.

50. ____Police officers have reason to be distrustful of most citizens.

51. ___A good patrol officer is one who patrols aggressively by stopping cars, checking out people, running license checks, and so forth.

52. ____Assisting citizens is just as important as enforcing the law.

53. ___ A good patrol officer will try to find out what residents think the neighborhood problems are.

54. ___ In order to do their jobs, patrol officers must sometimes overlook search and seizure laws and other legal guidelines.

[HAND LIST F TO R.]

Here are some different kinds of incidents or conditions citizens sometimes ask police to handle. I'd like to know how often, in your view, patrol officers should be expected to do something about each of these situations. For each one, please check whether you think that they should be expected to do something always, much of the time, sometimes, or never.

[Enter Responses below from the List Completed by R.]

[1] always *[2] much of the time* *[3] sometimes* *[4] never*

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

55. ___ public nuisances (e.g., loud parties, barking dogs)

56. ___ neighbor disputes

57. ___ family disputes

58. ____ litter and trash

59. ____ parents who don't control their kids

60. ____ nuisance businesses that cause lots of problems for neighbors

OK, I have one more question about police work in general.

61. ___ How frequently would you say there are good reasons for not arresting someone who has committed a minor criminal offense? Would you say that it is ...

[1] often [2] sometimes [3] rarely [4] never

[HAND LIST G TO R.]

Here is a list of goals that police are sometimes expected to accomplish.
Please look these over and mark with an 'X' the TWO that you believe are the MOST important for PATROL OFFICERS.

Then please mark with an 'O' the TWO that you believe are the LEAST important for PATROL OFFICERS.

[Enter R's Responses on the Lines below.]

X = 1 = Most Important
O = 5 = Least Important

62. ____ Handling the runs for their assigned area

63. ____ Making arrests and issuing citations

64. ____ Reducing the number of repeat runs to the same address

65. ____ Seizing drugs, guns, and other contraband

66. ____ Reducing the level of public disorders

67. ____ Getting the public involved in improving the neighborhood

68. ____ Reducing the public's fear of crime

[HAND LIST H TO R.]

Here are some questions about your work unit, that is, the officers who work in your district and on your shift. For each one, please circle the number that best indicates your opinion.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

[Enter Response below from the List Completed by R.]
[1] better than most others
[2] about the same as most others
[3] not as good as most others

69. ___ Compared to other police squads or units, how would you rate the job your unit does?

[Enter Responses below from the List Completed by R.]

[1] all or most [2] about half [3] a few [4] none

70. ___ How many officers in your unit would you consider to be your friends?

71. ___ If you obtained some hard-to-get information about the identity of an offender causing a lot of trouble in your district, with how many of the officers in your unit would you share this information?

72. ___ How many officers in your unit would say that enforcing the law is by far a patrol officer's most important responsibility?

73. ___ How many officers in your unit would say that police officers have reason to be distrustful of most citizens?

74. ___ How many officers in your unit would say that assisting citizens is just as important as enforcing the law?

75. ___ How many officers in your unit would say that in order to do their jobs, they must sometimes overlook legal guidelines?

Now I have a few questions about the supervision that you receive.

76. ___ I'd like you to think about the sergeant who would most often supervise you in the field and to whom you would most often report. In a word or two, how would you describe your supervisor?

_____ [2-digit code in 76]

[If R Cannot Identify a Single Sergeant Who Supervises Him/her, Then Ask R to Describe the Sergeant Who is the Most Responsible for Supervising R. Enter on Line Above.]

78. ___ [If R Cannot Identify a Single Sergeant Who Supervises Him/her, Then Enter a '1' Here and Ask R to Describe the Supervisor with Whom R Has the Most Contact. Enter the Description on the Line Above.]

[HAND LIST I TO R.]
Here are some statements about your supervisor. For each one, please circle the number that best indicates your experience or opinion.

[Enter Responses below from the List Completed by R.]
[1] agree strongly *[3] disagree somewhat*
[2] agree somewhat *[4] disagree strongly*

79. ___ The decisions or judgments I make are seldom criticized or modified by my supervisor.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

80. ___ My supervisor lets officers know what is expected of them.

81. ___ My supervisor's approach tends to discourage me from giving extra effort.

82. ___ My supervisor has a lot of professional experience to help officers do their jobs.

83. ___ My supervisor looks out for the personal welfare of his/her subordinates.

84. ____ My supervisor is NOT the type of person I enjoy working with.

85. ___ My supervisor will support me when I am right, even if it makes things difficult for him or her.

86. ____ I have complete faith in my supervisor.

[Enter Responses below from the List Completed by R.]

[1] always [2] usually [3] sometimes [4] rarely [5] never

87. ___ When you try a new approach to doing your job and it doesn't work, how often does your supervisor treat it as an honest effort and not a disciplinary matter.

88. ___ When your work unit has a problem that higher-ups could straighten out, how often is your supervisor able to get those higher-ups to actually do something about the problem?

Now think about your supervisor's priorities.

[HAND LIST J TO R.]

Please look over this list and mark the TWO goals that you think your supervisor would say are the MOST important for patrol officers, and then mark the TWO that you think your supervisor would say are the LEAST important.
Remember, 'X' is for the most important, and 'O' is for the least important.

[Enter R's Responses on the Lines below.]

X = 1 = Most Important
O = 5 = Least Important

89. ____ Handling the runs for your assigned area

90. ____ Making arrests and issuing citations

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

91. ____ Reducing the number of repeat runs to the same address

92. ____ Seizing drugs, guns, and other contraband

93. ____ Reducing the level of public disorders

94. ____ Getting the public involved in improving the neighborhood

95. ____ Reducing the public's fear of crime

Now I have a few questions about the district management in the [NAME] district.

[HAND LIST K TO R.]

First I'd like you to think about the priorities of district management here. Please look over this list and mark the TWO goals that you think DISTRICT MANAGEMENT would say are the MOST important for patrol officers.

Then mark the TWO goals that you think DISTRICT MANAGEMENT would say are the LEAST important.

Remember, 'X' is for the most important, and 'O' is for the least important.

[Enter R's Responses on the Lines below.]

X = 1 = Most Important
O = 5 = Least Important

96. ____ Handling the runs for your assigned area

97. ____ Making arrests and issuing citations

98. ____ Reducing the number of repeat runs to the same address

99. ____ Seizing drugs, guns, and other contraband

100. ____ Reducing the level of public disorders

101. ____ Getting the public involved in improving the neighborhood

102. ____ Reducing the public's fear of crime

[HAND LIST L OF RESPONSE CATEGORIES TO R.]

I have a few more questions about district management in the [NAME] district. Here are the response categories for these questions.

103. ___When an officer does a particularly good job, how likely is it that top management will publicly recognize his or her performance? *[Prompt as necessary: Would you say that it is ...]*
[1] very likely [2] somewhat likely [3] somewhat unlikely [4] very unlikely

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

104. ___When an officer gets written up for a minor violation of the rules, how likely is it that he or she will be treated fairly? *[Prompt as necessary: Would you say that it is ...]*
[1] very likely [2] somewhat likely [3] somewhat unlikely [4] very unlikely

105. ___When an officer contributes to a team effort rather than look good individually how likely is it that top management here will recognize it?
[Prompt as necessary: Would you say that it is ...]
[1] very likely [2] somewhat likely [3] somewhat unlikely [4] very unlikely

[HAND LIST M OF RESPONSE CATEGORIES TO R.]

Now I have a few questions about IPD's efforts to implement problem solving. Here are the response categories.

106. ___How well has IPD done in clarifying the role of regular patrol officers in problem solving?
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it has done ...]
[1] excellent [2] good [3] fair [4] poor

107. ___How well has IPD done in distributing the workload fairly between problem solving specialists and officers who are responsible for taking runs?
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it has done ...]
[1] excellent [2] good [3] fair [4] poor

108. ___How well has IPD done in giving officers enough time for problem solving?
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it has done ...]
[1] excellent [2] good [3] fair [4] poor

109. ___How well has IPD done in providing the information officers need on the problems in their assigned areas?
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it has done ...]
[1] excellent [2] good [3] fair [4] poor

110. ___How well has IPD done in rewarding officers who do a good job with problem solving?
[PROMPT AS NECESSARY: Would you say that it has done ...]
[1] excellent [2] good [3] fair [4] poor

We're almost finished now. I just have a few questions about your background.

111. ___In what year did you begin working for IPD as a sworn police officer?
[Enter Last Two Digits of Year, 19___ .]

113. ___ Did you work as a sworn police officer for any other department before you came to work for IPD?

[1] no [GO TO Q-116] [2] yes

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

114. ___IF YES: For how many years? [Enter 2 Digits]

116. ____ How long have you worked in this district? [Enter 2 digits for years]

118. ____ [Enter 2 digits for months]

120. ___Would you say that, for you personally, getting promoted is ...

[1] very important
[2] somewhat important
[3] somewhat unimportant
[4] very unimportant

121. ___Would you say that, for you personally, moving from district patrol to a specialized unit, such as criminal investigations, is ...

[1] very important
[2] somewhat important
[3] somewhat unimportant
[4] very unimportant

122. ___In what year were you born? [Enter Last Two Digits of Year.]

124. ___What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

[DO NOT READ, BUT BE PREPARED TO PROBE.]

[1] less than high school
[2] high school diploma or GED
[3] some junior college, but did not earn a degree
[4] associates degree (AA)
[5] more than two years of college, but did not earn bachelors degree
[6] bachelors degree
[7] some graduate courses, but did not earn graduate degree
[8] graduate degree
[0] refused to answer

125. ____ How tall are you? ____ ft ____ inches
[Convert to Inches. Enter 2 digits]

[HAND LIST N OF RESPONSE CATEGORIES TO R.]

127. ____ Could you tell me how much you weigh?

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

[1] 100 or less
[2] 101 - 120
[3] 121 - 140
[4] 141 - 160
[5] 161 - 180
[6] 181 - 200
[7] 201 - 220
[8] 221 - 240
[9] over 240
[0] refused

128. ___Would you identify yourself as ...

[1] white
[2] black [or African-American]
[3] Latino
[4] Asian
[DON'T READ]
[5] other (specify)_____

OK, that's all of the questions. Thanks for your time. Do you have any questions that I could answer?

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

DO NOT ASK BUT CODE:

129. ___Site [1] Indianapolis [2] St. Petersburg

130. ___District
[1] North
[2] East
[3] South
[4] West
[5] Downtown

131. _____ Respondent identification number
[USE 4-DIGIT POPN ASSIGNED #.]

135. ___R's sex [1] male [2] female

136. ___R's race [1] white [2] black [3] Latino [4] Asian [5] other

137. ___R's unit [1] beat officer [2] community policing specialist
[3] other specialist

138. ___R's shift [1] day [2] day tact [3] middle [4] late tact [5] late

139. ____ Interviewer ID code. [Enter your 2-digit code]

141. ___ Today's date -- Month. [Use 1 digit.]

142. ____ Today's date -- Day. [Use 2 digits.]

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX C: RIDE FORM

1. Site number?

   1 Indianapolis
   2 St. Petersburg

2. Ride number?

   ENTER THE RIDE NUMBER FROM YOUR OBSERVATION WORKSHEET.

3. Your observer code?

   ENTER YOUR OBSERVER ID CODE.

4. Date ride began?

   USE 4 DIGITS: 2 FOR MONTH AND 2 FOR DAY.

5. Official start time of observation session?

   ENTER 4-DIGIT, 24-HOUR CLOCK TIME.

   0000 = midnight 1200 = noon

6. Official end time of observation session?

   ENTER 4-DIGIT, 24-HOUR CLOCK TIME.

   0000 = midnight 1200 = noon

7. Unit?

   1 beat officer
   2 community policing specialist (e.g., tact)
   3 other specialist
   4 sergeant/supervisor of patrol unit
   5 other sergeant/supervisor (district level or HQ)
   6 other

8. Beat assignment?

   USE BEAT ASSIGNMENT CODE: 3-DIGIT CODE.

   CONVERT FIRST (ALPHA) CHARACTER (DISTRICT) TO NUMERIC:
   NORTH = A = 1
   EAST = B = 2
   SOUTH = C = 3
   WEST = D = 4

   THEN APPEND 2-DIGIT NUMERIC. EXAMPLE B61 = 261.

9. What was the geographic assignment of this officer/unit on

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

this ride?

1 study beat only
2 two or more beats (including study beat because of temporary staffing shortage)
3 multiple beats (part of routine assignment for this unit)
4 entire district
5 other

10. O1's ID number?

SEE OFFICER ID CODES.

11. How long has O1 been regularly assigned to this beat/area of responsibility?

ENTER TIME--IN MONTHS. ENTER ZERO IF THIS IS NOT O1'S REGULARLY ASSIGNED BEAT.

12. At the beginning of the ride (first half hour), what was O1's attitude about having an observer present?

1 very negative
2 negative
3 neutral
4 positive
5 very positive

13. At the end of the ride (last half hour), what was O1's attitude about having an observer present?

1 very negative
2 negative
3 neutral
4 positive
5 very positive

14. O2's ID number?

SEE OFFICER ID CODES.

IF THERE IS NO O2, ENTER ZERO. [GO TO Q-18]

15. How long has O2 been regularly assigned to this beat/area of responsibility?

ENTER TIME--IN MONTHS. ENTER ZERO IF THIS IS NOT O1'S REGULARLY ASSIGNED BEAT.

16. At the beginning of the ride (first half hour), what was O2's attitude about having an observer present?

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1 very negative
2 negative
3 neutral
4 positive
5 very positive

17. At the end of the ride (last half hour), what was O2's attitude about having an observer present?

1 very negative
2 negative
3 neutral
4 positive
5 very positive

18. For what percentage of this ride was there light precipitation outdoors?

ENTER NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 100.

19. For what percentage of this ride was there heavy precipitation outdoors?

ENTER NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 100.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX D: ENCOUNTER FORM

1. Site number?

   1 Indianapolis
   2 St. Petersburg

2. Ride number?

   ENTER THE NUMBER FROM THE OBSERVATION WORKSHEET.

3. Encounter number?

   ENTER THE NUMBER FROM THE OBSERVATION WORKSHEET.

4. Event sequence number?

   ENTER THE NUMBER OF THIS EVENT IN ORDER OF OCCURRENCE DURING THE RIDE, COUNTING BOTH ACTIVITIES & ENCOUNTERS THAT OCCURRED PREVIOUSLY.

5. Incident number?

   ENTER THE INCIDENT NUMBER FROM THE OBSERVATION WORKSHEET.

   IF THIS ENCOUNTER IS NOT RELATED TO ANY OTHER EVENT DURING THIS RIDE, ENTER -9.

6. Time encounter began? (24 hour clock)

   0000 = midnight 1200 = noon

7. Time encounter ended? (24 hour clock)

   0000 = midnight 1200 = noon

8. How did encounter begin?
   1 observed officer initiated
   2 dispatcher initiated
   3 supervisor/admin. initiated
   4 other officer initiated
   5 citizen initiated (on scene) [GO TO Q-10]
   6 citizen-initiated (telephone, other)
   7 other

9. How did officer proceed to the scene of this encounter?

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1 by motor vehicle: within posted speed; no lights/siren
2 by motor vehicle: within posted speed; lights/siren
3 by motor vehicle: above posted speed; no lights/siren
4 by motor vehicle: above posted speed; lights/siren
5 by foot/bike: walking/normal speed
6 by foot/bike: running/above normal speed
7 not applicable: officer at scene at beginning of encounter

10. Initial geographic location of encounter?

Intersecting streets:
1st Digit: 1=North 2=South
2nd-3rd Digit: 100-block designation
4th Digit: 3=East 4=West
5th-6th Digit: 100-block designation

11. Nature of initial location of encounter?

1 public property, outdoors (e.g., road, sidewalk, park)
2 public property, indoors (e.g., government building)
3 police facility, outdoors (e.g., police parking lot)
4 police facility, indoors (e.g., police station)
5 private property, outdoors (e.g., yard, front porch)
6 private property, indoors (e.g., home)
7 mass private property, outdoors (e.g., sports facility)
8 mass private property, indoors (e.g., shopping mall)
9 other

12. At any time during this ride did the police indicate or show that they had prior knowledge of this location? SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE NUMBER.

1 no
2 yes, information from roll call
3 yes, heard about it from department or other officers (not roll call)
4 yes, direct knowledge from prior visits
5 yes, police showed prior knowledge of location, but basis of knowledge not clear

13. Nature of second location.
-9 NO SECOND LOCATION--NOT APPLICABLE
1 public property, outdoors (e.g., road, sidewalk, park)

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

2 public property, indoors (e.g., government building)
3 police facility, outdoors (e.g., police parking lot)
4 police facility, indoors (e.g., police station)
5 private property, outdoors (e.g., yard, front porch)
6 private property, indoors (e.g., home)
7 mass private property, outdoors (e.g., sports facility)
8 mass private property, indoors (e.g., shopping mall)
9 other

14. What was the level of illumination when this encounter began?

1 Daylight/brightly lit room: could readily distinguish facial features and hands of persons if present
2 Dim lighting: could distinguish profile or overall size of persons or objects
3 Near darkness: could distinguish movement or presence of something, but not enough light to determine size or nature of object
4 Total/virtual darkness: unable to see anything

15. Before the encounter began, was there any indication of anticipated violence at the scene?

1 no
2 yes, from officer
3 yes, from other source
4 yes, from both officer and other source

16. Was this a BRIEF/CASUAL ENCOUNTER?

1 no
2 yes, brief encounter [GO TO Q-47]
3 yes, casual encounter [GO TO Q-47]

17. Type of problem--as radioed by dispatcher or others:

CODE -9 IF NOT DISPATCHED OR RADIOED BY OTHERS

OTHERWISE, ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

18. Type of problem as it appeared at beginning of encounter:

ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

19. Type of problem as it appeared at end of encounter: Most Important Problem?

20. Type of problem as it appeared at end of encounter: Second Most Important Problem?

ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

21. Did the police indicate that the problem in this encounter is part of a larger problem than just the circumstances of this event?

1 no [GO TO Q-24]
2 yes

22. What was the nature of the larger problem identified by the police?

ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

23. During this encounter, did the police try to determine the nature, extent, or causes of the larger problem?

1 no
2 yes

24. During this encounter, did the police try to PREVENT the occurrence or recurrence of the problem?

1 no
2 yes

25. Was this encounter part of a long-term plan or project to deal with this problem? [LONG-TERM = LONGER THAN THIS RIDE]

1 no [GO TO Q-27]
2 yes, plan focused on specific people or location
3 yes, plan focused on this kind of problem in general
4 yes, unable to determine nature of plan

26. Who created the plan or project of which this encounter was a part?

SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE NUMBER

1 officer--or officer with others
2 other police officers only
3 supervisors or management
4 other
5 unable to determine who created the plan/project

27. Who took the decision-making lead in this encounter?

1 O1 only
2 O1 and other police shared equally
3 other police, but not O1

4 O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

5 O2 only (2-officer unit only)
6 O2 and other police shared equally (2-officer unit only)
7 unable to determine

28. Did O1 receive advice, guidance, or instructions during this encounter about what to do from a NONSUPERVISOR police officer?

IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE FIRST THAT OCCURRED.

1 no [GO TO Q-30]
2 yes, take an action
3 yes, do NOT take an action
4 yes, other

29. What action was O1 advised to take or not take by another NONSUPERVISOR police officer?
1 arrest/cite someone
2 use force/more force on someone
3 file an official report/how to report the matter
4 notify/summon supervisor
5 mobilize other police/nonpolice for assistance
6 counsel, advise, mediate w/citizen(s)
7 give citizen other personal assistance
8 leave scene/do as little as possible
9 other

30. Did the officer request input from the SUPERVISOR during this encounter?

INCLUDE RADIO/MDT/TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS.

1 no
2 yes, information, advice, or instruction
3 yes, supervisor presence
4 yes, both 2 and 3
5 yes, not sure which of the above

31. At any time during the ride did the police discuss this encounter with a supervisor? [INCLUDE RADIO/MDT/TELEPHONE]

1 no [GO TO Q-34]
2 yes, before encounter only
3 yes, during encounter only
4 yes, after encounter only
5 yes, before and during encounter
6 yes, before and after encounter

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

7 yes, during and after encounter
8 yes, before, during, and after encounter

32. Did the supervisor tell the officer what to do regarding THIS encounter?

IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE FIRST THAT OCCURRED.

1 no [GO TO Q-34]
2 yes, offered suggestion only: take an action
3 yes, offered suggestion only: do NOT take an action
4 yes, ordered officer: take an action
5 yes, ordered officer: do NOT take an action
6 yes, could not determine which of 2-5 applies

33. What action was O1 advised/ordered to take or not take by the supervisor?

1 arrest/cite someone
2 use force/more force on someone
3 file an official report/how to report the matter
4 notify/summon higher supervisor
5 mobilize other police/nonpolice for assistance
6 counsel, advise, mediate w/citizen(s)
7 give citizen other personal assistance
8 leave scene/do as little as possible
9 other

34. For what percentage of the encounter was a supervisor present?

ENTER A NUMBER BETWEEN 0-100. "PRESENT" MEANS OBSERVABLE BY THE OFFICER. RADIO/MDT/TELEPHONE CONTACT DOES NOT COUNT AS BEING PRESENT.

35. What is the identity of the first supervisor present?

USE OFFICER ID CODE.

36. What is the identity of the second supervisor present?

37. What is the identity of the third supervisor present?

38. Upon arrival at the scene, how many police officers were already present?

ENTER NUMBER.

39. Upon arrival at the scene, how many non-sworn service personnel were already present?

ENTER NUMBER.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

40. Upon arrival at the scene, how many citizens (bystanders + participants) were present?

ENTER NUMBER.

41. Including your assigned officer(s), what was the maximum number of officers present at any one time during the encounter?

ENTER NUMBER.

42. What was the maximum number of non-sworn service personnel present at any one time during the encounter?

ENTER NUMBER.

43. What was the maximum number of citizens (bystanders + participants) present at any one time during the encounter?

ENTER NUMBER.

44. Did the police seek information from any source other than citizen participants during this encounter?

1 no [GO TO Q-46]
2 yes

45. From what source did they seek information?

46. Did the observed police call for more police officers to go to the scene?

DO NOT CODE THIS ITEM -9 UNLESS THIS WAS A BRIEF ENCOUNTER.

1 no [GO TO Q-48]
2 yes, while enroute to the scene [GO TO Q-48]
3 yes, while at the scene [GO TO Q-48]

47. Type of problem/situation? [SELECT MOST IMPORTANT]

ENTER PROBLEM CODE

48. Did the police file an official report or indicate an intention to file an official report regarding this encounter?

1 no, neither filed nor intended to file
2 yes, filed an official report
3 yes, intended to file an official report

49. What percentage of this encounter did you observe O1

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

directly?

ENTER A NUMBER BETWEEN 0-100.

50. Was another project observer present during this encounter?

1 no [GO TO Q-52]
2 yes

51. What was the identification code of the observer present?

52. Did the police change their behavior because of your or other observer presence?

1 no significant change [GO TO Q-55]
2 yes, a little change
3 yes, a substantial change

53. In what way did the police change their behavior during this encounter because of observer presence?
SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE NUMBER

1 police more inclined to get involved
2 police less inclined to get involved
3 police more inclined to arrest or cite
4 police less inclined to arrest or cite
5 police more inclined to use force
6 police less inclined to use force
7 other

54. What is the basis of your judgment that police changed their behavior because of observer presence?

1 police stated that their behavior changed
2 observer inferred it from behavior or manner of police
3 other

55. Did you perform any police tasks during this activity?

1 no
2 yes, offered police information, advice, or an opinion
3 yes, performed some physical aspect of police work
4 yes, had more than casual communication with citizens
5 yes, two or more of the above

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX E: CITIZEN FORM

1. Site?

   1 Indianapolis
   2 St. Petersburg

2. Ride number?

   ENTER THE NUMBER FROM THE OBSERVATION WORKSHEET.

3. Encounter number?

   ENTER THE NUMBER FROM THE OBSERVATION WORKSHEET.

4. Citizen number?

   ENTER THE NUMBER FROM THE OBSERVATION WORKSHEET.

5. When the police first encountered this citizen, what role did this citizen indicate he/she had?

   ENTER CITIZEN ROLE CODE.

6. In what role did the police place this citizen when first encountering him/her?

   ENTER CITIZEN ROLE CODE.

7. What was the final role placed on this citizen by police (at the end of the encounter)?

   ENTER CITIZEN ROLE CODE.

8. What is the citizen's sex?

   1 male
   2 female

9. What is the citizen's age?

   1 preschool (up to 5 years)
   2 child (6-12)
   3 young teen (13-17)
   4 older teen (18-20)
   5 young adult (21-29)
   6 adult (30-44)
   7 middle-aged (45-59)
   8 senior (60 and above)

10. What is the citizen's race/ethnicity?

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1 white
2 black
3 Hispanic
4 Asian
5 American Indian
6 other

11. What level of wealth did the citizen appear to have?

1 chronic poverty (homeless, no apparent means of support)
2 low (subsistence only)
3 middle
4 above middle

12. What kind of establishment was the citizen representing?

1 none
2 business
3 government agency
4 church
5 neighborhood organization
6 other

13. What was the officer's prior knowledge of this citizen? SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 no knowledge at all. Citizen is a stranger
2 knows citizen, but not clear how well
3 recognizes citizen's face or knows reputation, but no detailed knowledge
4 knows by name and a little knowledge of citizen, but not detailed
5 knows citizen very well (personal background, address, friends, family, personal habits)

14. Is there any indication that this citizen lives, routinely works, or owns property at or near the encounter location (within 3 city blocks or 1/4 mile)?

SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE NUMBER.

1 no
2 yes, works at or near location
3 yes, owns property at or near location
4 yes, lives at or near location

15. Did this citizen appear to be under the influence of alcohol or other drugs?

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1 no indication of alcohol/drug use
2 indication of use, but no visible effects on behavior
3 slight behavioral indications (slight speech)
4 strong behavioral indications (strong speech, difficulty standing/understanding conversation)
5 unconscious

16. Did this citizen show any signs of mental disorder?

1 no
2 yes

17. Did this citizen show any signs of physical injury or illness requiring immediate medical attention?

1 no
2 yes, minor injury or illness
3 yes, serious injury or illness

18. Did this citizen have a weapon in his/her possession or within "jump and reach?"
SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 no weapon evident [GO TO Q-20]
2 incapacitating device (mace,pepper spray)
3 blunt/martial arts instrument
4 knife/stabbing/cutting instrument
5 other weapon
6 firearm

19. Was this weapon concealed from the police at any time during the encounter?

1 no
2 yes, on citizen's person
3 yes, not on citizen's person

20. Did the citizen threaten to assault the police?

1 no
2 yes, before the police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
3 yes, during or after police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
4 yes, both 2 and 3 above

21. Did the citizen physically assault the police?

1 no

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

2 yes, before the police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
3 yes, during or after police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
4 yes, both 2 and 3 above

22. Did this citizen flee or attempt to flee the police?

1 no
2 yes, before the police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
3 yes, during or after police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
4 yes, both 2 and 3 above

23. Did this citizen summon the police to this encounter?

1 no
2 yes
3 not clear whether citizen summoned police

24. Was this a BRIEF/CASUAL ENCOUNTER?

1 no
2 yes, brief encounter [GO TO Q-130]
3 yes, casual encounter [GO TO Q-130]

25. Did the citizen ask the police to arrest another citizen involved in this encounter?

1 no [GO TO Q-27]
2 yes

26. How did the police respond to citizen's request to arrest another citizen?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 ignored request without acknowledging it
2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3 declined to comply and explained why
4 promised to comply at some future time
5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

27. Did the citizen ask the police NOT to arrest or cite someone else?

1 no [GO TO Q-29]
2 yes

28. How did the police respond to the citizen's request NOT to

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

arrest or cite someone else?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 ignored request without acknowledging it
2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3 declined to comply and explained why
4 promised to comply at some future time
5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

29. Did the citizen ask the police to advise or persuade another citizen (not a representative of service organization)to do something?

1 no [GO TO Q-31]
2 yes

30. How did the police respond to the citizen's request to advise or persuade another citizen to do something?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 ignored request without acknowledging it
2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3 declined to comply and explained why
4 promised to comply at some future time
5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

31. Did the citizen ask the police to warn or threaten another citizen?

1 no [GO TO Q-33]
2 yes

32. How did the police respond to the citizen's request to warn or threaten another citizen?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 ignored request without acknowledging it
2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3 declined to comply and explained why
4 promised to comply at some future time

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

33. Did the citizen ask the police to make another citizen leave the scene?

1 no [GO TO Q-35]
2 yes

34. How did the police respond to the citizen's request to make another citizen leave the scene?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 ignored request without acknowledging it
2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3 declined to comply and explained why
4 promised to comply at some future time
5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

35. Did the citizen ask the police to file a report?

1 no [GO TO Q-37]
2 yes

36. How did the police respond to the citizen's request to file a report?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 ignored request without acknowledging it
2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3 declined to comply and explained why
4 promised to comply at some future time
5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

37. Did the citizen ask police to act on the citizen's behalf with a government official/agency, or private organization?

1 no [GO TO Q-40]
2 yes

38. How did the police respond to the citizen's request to act on his/her behalf with a government official/agency, or private organization? SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 ignored request without acknowledging it [GO TO Q-40]

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why [GO TO Q-40]
3 declined to comply and explained why [GO TO Q-40]
4 promised to comply at some future time
5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

39. What agency/organization did police contact or promise to contact on the citizen's behalf?

ENTER AGENCY CODE.

ENTER ZERO IF AGENCY/ORGANIZATION NOT CLEAR.

40. What agency/organization did police contact or promise to contact on the citizen's behalf--on their OWN INITIATIVE (without citizen's request)

ENTER AGENCY CODE.

ENTER ZERO IF POLICE DID NOT CONTACT/PROMISE CONTACT ON OWN INITIATIVE.

41. Did the citizen ask the police for physical assistance for self or others?

1 no [GO TO Q-43]
2 yes

42. How did the police respond to the citizen's request for physical assistance for self or others?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 ignored request without acknowledging it
2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3 declined to comply and explained why
4 promised to comply at some future time
5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

43. Did the police provide physical assistance to this citizen on their OWN INITIATIVE (without citizen's request)?

1 no
2 yes

44. Did the citizen ask police for information on how to deal with a problem?

1 no [GO TO Q-46]
2 yes

45. How did the police respond to the citizen's request for

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

information on how to deal with a problem?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 ignored request without acknowledging it
2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3 declined to comply and explained why
4 promised to comply at some future time
5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

46. Did the police provide this citizen information on how to deal with a problem on their OWN INITIATIVE (without citizen's request)?

1 no
2 yes

47. Did the police threaten to issue a citation to this citizen?

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1

5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

48. Did the police issue a citation (or summons to appear before a magistrate) to this citizen?

1 no [GO TO Q-50]
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1
5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

49. For what offense was the citizen CITED? [FIRST OFFENSE]

ENTER OFFENSE CODE. DO NOT USE FELONY OR MISDEMEANOR CODES.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

50. Did the police notify, promise, or threaten to notify another government agency about citizen's wrongdoing?

1 no [GO TO Q-52]
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1

5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

51. What agency did police notify, promise, or threaten To notify about citizen's wrongdoing?

ENTER AGENCY CODE.

52. Did the police check for outstanding arrest warrants on this citizen?

1 no
2 yes

53. Did the police hold a warrant to arrest this person?

1 no
2 yes, held by officer(s) at scene
3 yes, held by other police or legal authority not at scene

54. Did the police threaten to charge this citizen with a criminal offense?

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1

5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

55. Did the police arrest this citizen?

1 no [GO TO Q-66]
2 yes

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

56. BEFORE arresting the citizen for this offense, did police observe this citizen engage in an illegal act or observe circumstantial evidence of an illegal act?
SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE

1 no
2 yes, observed circumstantial evidence of illegal behavior
3 yes, observed citizen perform illegal act
4 yes, observed both circumstantial evidence and observed the citizen perform an illegal act

57. BEFORE arresting the citizen for this offense, did the police observe physical evidence that implicated this citizen in the offense?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 no
2 yes

58. BEFORE arresting the citizen for this offense, did the police hear claims from others that implicated this citizen in the offense?
SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.
1 no
2 yes, other citizen(s) had second-hand information implicating this citizen
3 yes, other citizen(s) observed citizen commit the offense
4 yes, this citizen fit the description of someone known to the officer as wanted by the police

59. BEFORE arresting the citizen for this offense, did the police hear this citizen confess to this offense?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 no
2 yes, partial confession (admitted involvement short of committing offense)
3 yes, full confession

60. BEFORE being arrested, did the citizen show disrespect to the police?

1 no
2 yes

61. BEFORE the citizen was arrested for this offense, did the police show disrespect to this citizen?

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1

5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

62. Who showed disresepect first, this citizen or the police?

1 citizen
2 police

63. Did the police indicate to the citizen that they would charge him/her with a criminal offense?

1 no [GO TO Q-65]
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1

5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

64. What is the FIRST offense with which the citizen was charged?

65. Did the police take this citizen into protective custody?

PROTECTIVE CUSTODY=CUSTODY FOR CITIZEN'S PROTECTION, NOT CRIMINAL CHARGES.

1 no [GO TO Q-73]
2 yes [GO TO Q-73]

66. Did police observe this citizen engage in an illegal act or observe circumstantial evidence of an illegal act?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE

1 no
2 yes, observed circumstantial evidence of illegal behavior
3 yes, observed citizen perform illegal act
4 yes, observed both circumstantial evidence and observed the citizen perform an illegal act

67. Did the police observe physical evidence that implicated

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

this citizen in a legal offense?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 no
2 yes

68. Did the police hear claims from others that implicated this citizen in a legal offense?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 no
2 yes, other citizens provided a description, but not citizen's name
3 yes, other citizens provided this citizen's name
4 yes, this citizen fit the description of someone known to the officer as wanted by the police

69. Did the police hear this citizen confess to a legal violation?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1 no
2 yes, partial confession (admitted involvement short of committing crime)
3 yes, full confession

70. Did the citizen show disrespect to the police?

1 no
2 yes

71. Did the police show disrespect to this citizen?

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1

5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

72. Who showed disrespect first, this citizen or the police?

[CODE -9 IF ONLY ONE OF THE PARTIES OR NONE OF THE PARTIES WAS DISRESPECTFUL]

1 citizen
2 police

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

73. Did the police interrogate this citizen?

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1

5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

74. Did the police hold a warrant to search for evidence on this person or his/her property?

1 no
2 yes

75. Did the police conduct a search of any of the following: the citizen, the area immediately around the citizen, his/her possessions, home, or automobile?

1 no [GO TO Q-77]
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1
5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

76. Which search was conducted before the citizen was arrested?

1 NOT APPLICABLE: Citizen was not arrested
2 the citizen's person
3 area immediately around the citizen
4 citizen's personal possessions
5 citizen's home
6 citizen's automobile
7 two or more of the above
8 search was conducted AFTER arrest

77. Did the police threaten to use physical force on this citizen? [INCLUDE BOTH VERBAL THREATS AND GESTURES.]

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1
5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

78. Did the police use a firm grip or non-pain restraint on this person?

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1
5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

79. Did the police handcuff this person?

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1
5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

80. Did the police use pain compliance on this person (hammerlock, wristlock, finger grip, carotid control, bar arm control)?

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1
5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

81. Did the police use impact or incapacitation methods on this person (striking with body or weapon, mace, taser)?

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1
5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

82. Did the police draw or discharge their firearm in this citizen's presence?

1 no
2 yes, O1 only

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1
5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

83. Did the police ask/tell the citizen to sign a formal complaint?
FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-86]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

84. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to sign a formal complaint?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

85. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Sign formal complaint)

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

86. Did the police ask/tell the citizen NOT to sign a formal complaint? FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-89]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

87. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen NOT to sign a formal complaint?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

88. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (NOT sign formal complaint)

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

89. Did the police ask/tell the citizen to use the legal process to solve their problem? FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-92]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

90. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to use the legal process?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

91. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Use legal process)

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

92. Did the police ask/tell the citizen to seek the help of

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

other service agencies to solve the problem? FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-96]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

93. What was the other service agency/organization police asked the citizen to use?

ENTER AGENCY CODE.

94. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to seek the help of other service agencies?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

95. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Get help from other service agency)

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

96. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to help another person with their problem? FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-99]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

97. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to help another person with their problem?

2 suggested only

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

98. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Help another person with their problem)

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

99. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to seek the help of family or friends with his/her problem? FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-102]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

100. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to seek the help of family or friends with his/her problem?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

101. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Seek the help of family or friends)?

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

102. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to leave another person alone, stop bothering them, or leave the premises? FIRST APPROACH

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

1 no [GO TO Q-105]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

103. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to leave another person alone, stop bothering them, or leave the premises?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

104. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Leave other person alone, leave premises, etc.)

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

105. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to cease disorderly behavior? FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-108]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

106. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to cease disorderly behavior?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

107. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Cease disorderly behavior)?

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

108. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to discontinue illegal behavior? FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-111]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

109. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to discontinue illegal behavior?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

110. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Discontinue illegal behavior)

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

111. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to provide information about the identity or location of a suspected wrongdoer? FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-114]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

112. What was the last approach police used to try to get the citizen to identify or locate a suspected wrongdoer?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

113. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Provide information on identity/location of wrongdoer)

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

114. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to control the person or animal responsible for this problem?
FIRST APPROACH

1 no [GO TO Q-117]
2 yes, suggested only
3 yes, requested only
4 yes, tried persuasion
5 yes, tried negotiation
6 yes, commanded citizen
7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

115. What was the last approach police used to try to get the citizen to control the person or animal responsible for this problem?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

116. What was the citizen's final response to this request? (Control the person/animal responsible for this problem)

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

117. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to call the police if the problem occurs again?

1 no
2 yes

118. Did the police tell the citizen NOT to call the police if the problem occurs again?

1 no
2 yes

119. Did the police comfort or reassure the citizen?

1 no
2 yes, O1 only
3 yes, O1 and other police
4 yes, other police but not O1

5 yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6 yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7 yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

120. During the encounter, with what other citizen present did this citizen show conflict?

ENTER THE CITIZEN NUMBER OF THAT CITIZEN.

[IF 0, GO TO Q-127]

121. What action did this citizen take toward the other citizen when the officer FIRST observed them interact?

THIS CITIZEN'S FIRST ACTION TOWARD OTHER CITIZEN

1 no conflictual behavior
2 calm verbal disagreement (no threats)
3 agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)
4 threatened to harm other citizen
5 assaulted other citizen

122. What action did the other citizen take toward this citizen when the officer FIRST observed them interact?

OTHER CITIZEN'S FIRST ACTION TOWARD THIS CITIZEN

1 no conflictual behavior
2 calm verbal disagreement (no threats)
3 agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

4 threatened harm to this citizen
5 assaulted this citizen

123. What was the MOST intense action taken by this citizen toward the other citizen during the encounter?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

2 calm verbal disagreement (no threats)
3 agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)
4 threatened to harm other citizen
5 assaulted other citizen

124. What was the MOST intense action taken by the other citizen toward this citizen during the encounter?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

2 calm verbal disagreement (no threats)
3 agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)
4 threatened harm to this citizen
5 assaulted this citizen

125. At the conclusion of the encounter, what was the nature of the conflict between these two citizens?

1 one or both citizens had departed the scene
2 amicably reconciled
3 calm disagreement (no threats)
4 agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)
5 threats of harm offered
6 in physical conflict

126. What was the relationship between these two citizens?

1 strangers
2 casually acquainted
3 well acquainted: relatives, household members
4 well acquainted: friends
5 well acquainted: neighbors
6 well acquainted: coworkers, long-term business associates
7 could not determine relationship

127. Was this citizen in conflict with another citizen who was NOT present during this encounter?

1 no
2 yes, strangers
3 yes, casually acquainted

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

4 yes, well acquainted: relatives, household members
5 yes, well acquainted: friends
6 yes, well acquainted: neighbors
7 yes, well acquainted: coworkers, long-term business associates
8 yes, could not determine relationship

128. Was this citizen encouraged to cooperate with police by another citizen present during this encounter (including bystanders)?

1 no
2 yes

129. Was this citizen encouraged NOT to cooperate with police by another citizen present during this encounter (including bystanders)?

DO NOT CODE THIS ITEM -9 UNLESS THIS WAS A BRIEF ENCOUNTER

1 no [GO TO Q-135]
2 yes [GO TO Q-135]

130. What did the citizen request/demand of the police?
SELECT MOST IMPORTANT
1 nothing [GO TO Q-132]
2 directions
3 information about police or other local services
4 other information/assistance
5 investigate problem/situation
6 deal with people causing problem for citizen
7 greetings, casual conversation
8 other

131. How did the police respond to the citizen's request/demand?

SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE

1 ignored request without acknowledging it
2 explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3 declined to comply and explained why
4 promised to comply at some future time
5 partially complied in citizen's presence
6 complied fully in citizen's presence

132. What did the police request/demand of the citizen?
SELECT MOST IMPORTANT.
1 nothing [GO TO Q-135]
2 information about self. Justify self/presence.
3 information about other suspect, crime, or disorder
4 other type of information/assistance to police
5 stop doing something disorderly, illegal, dangerous, leave scene
6 greeting, casual conversation

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

7 goods or services (e.g., purchases)
8 other

133. How did police communicate the request/demand?

2 suggested only
3 requested only
4 tried persuasion
5 tried negotiation
6 commanded citizen
7 threatened citizen explicitly

134. What was the citizen's final response to this request?

1 no indication one way or the other
2 refused
3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4 did it in police presence

136. What is the basis of your judgment that the citizen changed his/her behavior because of your or other observer presence?

1 citizen stated that his/her behavior changed
2 observer inferred it from behavior or manner of citizen
3 other

137. At the beginning of this encounter was the citizen in police custody?

1 no
2 yes, had been taken into custody earlier by observed officer(s)
3 yes, had been taken into custody earlier by other than observed officers

138. At the end of this encounter was the citizen in police custody?

1 no
2 yes

139. What best characterizes the citizen's emotional state at the beginning of the contact?

1 not elevated (calm)
2 elevated--fear or anger
3 elevated--happy
4 depressed--sadness, remorse

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

140. What best characterizes the citizen's emotional state at the end of the contact?

1 not elevated (calm)
2 elevated--fear or anger
3 elevated--happy
4 depressed--sadness, remorse

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.